UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) 4:21-cr-289-O Vol 8 January 20, 2022

```
1
                THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                          FORT WORTH DIVISION
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )
 4
 5
                                  CASE NO. 4:21-cr-289-0
          Government,
 6
     VS.
                                 ) FORT WORTH, TEXAS
 7
     HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW
     (1), BENJAMIN LEE WISSINK )
 8
     (2), CARA DELIN OBERT (3),)
     JEFFREY BRANDON JESTER
 9
     (4),
                                 )
                                 )
10
          Defendants.
                                 )
11
12
13
                            January 20, 2022
14
                                 VOLUME 8
                        TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE REED C. O'CONNOR
15
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

APPE	ARANCES:
FOR THE	GOVERNMENT:
	TIFFANY EGGERS, ESQ. RACHAEL JONES, ESQ.
	ELYSE LYONS, ESQ. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS
	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS 801 Cherry Street, Suite 1700
	Fort Worth, Texas 76102 Telephone: 817.252.5200
FOR THE	DEFENDANT GREENLAW:
	PAUL PELLETIER, ESQ. 3500 Morningside Drive
	Fairfax, Virginia 22031 Telephone: (202)617-9151
	-
	ROSE ROMERO, ESQ. ROMERO KOZUB
	325 NE Loop 820, Suite 310 Hurst, Texas 76053
	Telephone: (682)267-1351
FOR THE	DEFENDANT WISSINK:
	GUY A. LEWIS, ESQ. LAW OFFICES OF GUY A. LEWIS, PLLC
	12575 SW 67th Street Pinecrest, Florida 33156
	Telephone: (305)442.1101
	FOR THE

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) 4:21-cr-289-O Vol 8 January 20, 2022

Page 1451

1	FOR THE DEFENDANT OBERT:
2	NEAL J. STEPHENS, ESQ.
3	KELSEY DAVIDSON JONES DAY
4	1744 Embarcadero Road Palo Alto, California
5	Telephone: (650)739.3939
6	
7	FOR THE DEFENDANT JESTER:
8	JEFFREY J. ANSLEY, ESQ. ARIANNA GOODMAN, ESQ.
9	VEDDER PRICE 100 Crescent Court, Suite 350
10	Dallas, Texas Telephone: (469)895.4780
11	1010 p 1101101 (100)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case 4:21-cr-00289-O Document 308 Filed 01/29/22 Page 4 of 182 PageID 13322

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) 4:21-cr-289-O Vol 8 January 20, 2022

	4.21-ci-203-0 Voi o Sandary 20, 2022	Fage 1432
1	INDEX	
2	JURY CHARGE	1453
3		
4	CLOSING ARGUMENTS	
5	By Ms. Eggers	1484
6	By Mr. Pelletier	1509
7	By Ms. Goodman	1522
8	By Mr. Stephens	1535
9	By Mr. Lewis	1556
10	By Ms. Eggers	1572
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 1452

1 PROCEEDINGS -2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I have one final 3 4 instruction to give to you that I neglected to give to you 5 during the trial. So to the extent the parties reference Exhibit 64A 6 7 this morning, or to the extent you look at it during your deliberations, Exhibit 64A may not be used to contradict the 8 9 terms of any final written agreement and is not offered to 10 do so. You may consider Exhibit 64A to determine whether 11 12 defendants encountered the restrictions placed on the line 13 of credit to prove intent. 14 So remember that on Exhibit 64A. Now we're ready, both sides have rested and 15 closed, so we're ready to begin the final phase of the 16 17 trial. And that is, I will read to you the jury charge. 18 So members of the jury, in any jury trial there 19 are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges; the 20 jury is the other. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to decide what evidence is proper for your 21 22 consideration. 23 It is also my duty, at the end of the trial, to 24 explain to you the rules of law that you must follow and 25 apply in arriving at your verdict.

First, I will give you some general instructions which apply in every case, for example, instructions about burden of proof and how to judge the believability of witnesses. Then I will give you some specific rules of law about this particular case. And finally, I will explain the procedures you should follow in your deliberations.

You, as jurors, are judges of the facts. But in determining what actually happened, that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow all the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I may state to you. You must not substitute or follow your own notions or opinions as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence received during the trial and the law as given and explained to you by the Court, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted as the jurors, and the Court and the parties have the right to expect nothing less.

The indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence of guilt. All defendants are presumed by the law to be innocent. A defendant begins with

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a clean slate. The law does not require a defendant to

prove his or her innocence or produce any evidence at all,

and no inference whatever may be drawn from the election of

a defendant not to testify.

The government has the burden of proving each defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. And if it fails to do so, you must acquit any defendant whose guilt has not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. While the government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that any defendants' guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning a defendants' guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in making the most important decision of your own affairs.

As I told you earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts. To do so, you must consider only the evidence presented during the trial. Evidence is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, including stipulations and exhibits. The questions, statements, objections, or

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 | arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence.

The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their respective sides of the case. And in doing so, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your final notice.

In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that control in this case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

During the trial, I sustained objections to certain questions and exhibits. You must disregard those questions and exhibits entirely. Do not speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer the question or as to the contents of an exhibit. Your verdict must be based solely on the legally admissible evidence and testimony.

Also, do not assume from anything I may have done or said during the trial that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for the instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own verdict.

In considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and

1 reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to 2 draw from the facts which have been established by the 3 evidence. 4 Do not be concerned about whether the evidence is 5 direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. You should consider and weigh all of the evidence that was presented to 6 7 you. Direct evidence is the testimony of one who 8 9 asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. 10 Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of events and 11 circumstances indicating that something is or is not a fact. The law makes no distinction between the weights 12 to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. 13 14 the law requires that you, after weighing all of the 15 evidence, whether direct or circumstantial, be convinced of the quilt of a defendant beyond a reasonable doubt before 16 17 you can find him or her guilty. 18 I remind you that it is your job to decide whether 19 or not the government has proved the guilt of each 20 defendant, individually, beyond a reasonable doubt. In

You are the sole judges of the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given to

doing so, you must consider all of the evidence. This does

not mean, however, that you must accept all of the evidence

21

22

23

24

25

as true or accurate.

1 An important part of your job will the witness's testimony. 2 be making judgment about the testimony of witnesses, 3 including the defendants who testified in this case. 4 You should decide whether you believe all, some 5 part, or none of what each person had to say, and how important that testimony was. 6 In making that decision, I suggest that you ask 7 yourself a few questions: Did the person impress you as 8 9 honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to 10 tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in 11 the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any 12 relationship with either the government or the defense? Did 13 the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness 14 clearly see or hear the things about which he or she 15 testified? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability 16 17 to understand the questions clearly and answer them 18 directly? Did the witness's testimony differ from the 19 testimony of other witnesses? These are a few of the 20 considerations that will help you determine the accuracy of 21 what each witness said. Hollis Greenlaw, Cara Obert, and Brandon Jester 22 23 have testified. Their testimony should be weighed and their 24 credibility evaluated in the same way as that of any other 25 witness.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your job is to think about the testimony of each witness you have heard and decide how much you believe of what each witness had to say. In making up your mind and reaching a verdict, do not make any decision simply because there were more witnesses on one side than on the other. Do not reach a conclusion on a particular point just because there were more witnesses testifying for one side on that point. You will always bear in mind that the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witness or producing any evidence. Whether a defendant has offered evidence of good reputation for opinion testimony -- this should be "or," Is that right? Whether a defendant is offered evidence of good -- good general reputation or opinion testimony? MS. EGGERS: Yes, your Honor. MR. STEPHENS: Yes, your Honor. MS. GOODMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. So let me start over with that sentence. I found a typo. Where a defendant has offered opinion -- has offered evidence of good general reputation or opinion testimony concerning truth and veracity, honesty and integrity, or character as a law-abiding citizen, you should

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consider such evidence, along with all the other evidence in the case.

Evidence of a defendants' character, inconsistent with those traits of character ordinarily involved in the commission of the crime charged, may give rise to a reasonable doubt, since you may think it improbable that a person of good character with respect to those traits would commit such a crime.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited by showing that the witness testified falsely or by evidence that, at some other time, the witness said or did something or failed to say or do something, which is inconsistent with the testimony the witness gave at this trial.

Earlier statements of a witness were not admitted in evidence to prove that the content of those statements are true. You may not consider the earlier statements to prove that the content of an earlier statement is true; you may only use earlier statements to determine whether you think the earlier statements are consistent or inconsistent with the trail testimony of the witness and therefore, whether they affect the credibility of that witness.

If you believe that a witness has been discredited in this manner, it is your exclusive right to give the testimony of that witness whatever weight you think it deserves.

During the trial you heard testimony of certain witnesses who expressed opinions concerning various scientific, technical, or other matters involving specialized knowledge.

If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify and state an opinion concerning such matters.

Merely because such a witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you muster accept this opinion. You should judge such testimony like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, and all other evidence in this case.

You will note that the indictment charges that the offenses were committed on or about a specified date. The government does not have to prove that the crimes were committed on that exact date. So long as the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the crime on a date reasonably near January 1, 2011, through December 29, 2015, the dates stated in the

indictment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You are here to decide whether the government has proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, that each individual defendant is guilty of the crimes charged in the indictment. No defendant is on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not alleged in the indictment, neither are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case except as you are otherwise instructed.

If a defendant is found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment will be. You should not be concerned with punishment in any way. It should not enter your consideration or discussion.

A separate crime is charged against one or more of the defendants in each count of the indictment. Each count, and the evidence pertaining to it, should be considered separately. The case of each defendant should be considered separately and individually.

The fact that you may find one or more of the accused guilty or not guilty of any of the crimes charged should not control your verdict as to any other crime or any other defendant. You must give separate consideration to the evidence as to each defendant.

As used in these instructions, a representation is material if it has a natural tendency to influence or is

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

capable of influencing the decision of the person or entity to which it is addressed.

The government can prove materiality in either of two ways: First, a representation is material if a reasonable person would attach importance to its existence or nonexistence in determining his or her choice of action in the transaction in question.

Second, a statement could be material, even though only an unreasonable person would rely on it, if the person who made the statement knew or had reason to know his or her victim was likely to rely on it.

In determining materiality, you should consider that naivety, carelessness, negligence, or stupidity of a victim. You should consider that naivety, carelessness, negligence, or stupidity of a victim does not excuse criminal conduct, if any, on the part of the defendant.

The word "knowingly" means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally not because of a mistake or an accident.

Interstate commerce means commerce or travel between one state, territory, or possession of the United States in another state, territory, or possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

Summary charts prepared or relied upon by a witness have been received into evidence for the purpose of

1 explaining facts disclosed by testimony and exhibits which 2 are also in evidence in this case. If you find that such summary chart correctly 3 reflects the other evidence in the case, you may rely upon 4 5 them. And to the extent that you find that they are not 6 7 in truth summaries of the evidence in the case, you are to disregard them. The best evidence of what occurred are the 8 9 underlying records themselves. 10 Conspiracy to commit wire fraud Count I: 11 affecting a financial institution. The defendants are 12 charged in Count I of the indictment, conspiracy to commit 13 the offense of wire fraud affecting a financial institution 14 in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349 15 and Section 1343. Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349, makes 16 17 it a crime for two or more persons to conspire or commit the 18 offense of wire fraud. The elements of the crime of wire fraud affecting 19 20 a financial institution under Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343, are explained below. You are directed to read 21 22 those instructions on wire fraud before reaching a decision 23 on Count I.

A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to join together to accomplish some unlawful

24

25

1 It is a kind of partnership in crime in which each purpose. 2 member of the conspiracy becomes the agent of every other 3 member. 4 For you to find the defendant guilty of this 5 crime, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt. 6 7 First, that the defendant and at least one other person, agreed to commit the crime of wire fraud, as charged 8 9 in the indictment. 10 Second, that the defendant knew the unlawful 11 purpose of the agreement. Third, that the defendant joined in it willfully, 12 13 that is, with the intent to further the unlawful purpose. 14 One may become a member of a conspiracy without knowing all the details of the unlawful scheme or the 15 identities of all the other alleged conspirators. 16 17 If a defendant understands the unlawful nature of 18 a plan or scheme and knowingly and intentionally joins in 19 that plan or scheme on one occasion, that is sufficient to 20 convict him or her for conspiracy, even though the defendant had not participated before, and even though the defendant 21 22 played only a minor part. 23 The government does not need to prove that the 24 alleged conspirators entered into any formal agreement or 25 that they directly stated between themselves all the details

1 Likewise, the government does not need to of the scheme. 2 prove that all of the details of the scheme alleged in the 3 indictment were actually agreed upon or carried out. 4 Nor must it prove that all of the persons alleged 5 to have been members of the conspiracy were such or that the alleged conspirators actually succeeded in accomplishing 6 7 their unlawful objectives. The mere presence at the scene of an event, even 8 9 with knowledge that a crime is being committed, or the mere 10 fact that certain persons may have associated with each 11 other and may have assembled and discussed common aims and 12 interests does not necessarily establish proof of the 13 existence of a conspiracy. 14 Also, a person who has no knowledge of a 15 conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which advances some purpose of a conspiracy does not thereby become a 16 17 conspirator. 18 Title 18, United States Code, Wire Fraud. 19 Section 1343, makes it a crime for anyone to use interstate 20 wire communication in carrying out a scheme to defraud. 21 For you to find the defendant guilty of this 22 crime, you must be convinced that the government has proved 23 each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: 24 First, that the defendant knowingly devised or

intended to devise a scheme to defraud the investing public

25

1	or shareholders of UDF III, UDF IV, and UDF V.
2	Second, that the scheme to defraud employed false
3	material representations.
4	Third, that the defendant transmitted or caused to
5	be transmitted, by way of wire communications in interstate
6	commerce, any writing for the purpose of executing such
7	scheme.
8	And fourth, that the defendant acted with a
9	specific intent to defraud.
10	Additionally, if you find the government has
11	proven the preceding four elements beyond a reasonable
12	doubt, you should consider whether the government has also
13	proven the following element beyond a reasonable doubt.
14	Fifth, that the scheme to defraud affected a
15	financial institution.
16	Although the indictment may charge the defendants
17	with committing an offense in several ways by using the word
18	"and," it is not necessary for the government to prove that
19	the defendants did each of the things named in the
20	indictment.
21	It is sufficient if the government proves beyond a
22	reasonable doubt that the defendant did one of the
23	alternative acts as charged; however, you must unanimously
24	agree on which of the act the defendant committed.
25	A scheme to defraud means any plan, pattern, or

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

course of action intended to deprive another of money or property or bring about some financial gain to the person engaged in the scheme.

A specific intent to defraud means a conscious, knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone. A representation is false if it is known to be untrue or is made with reckless indifference as to its truth or falsity.

A representation would also be false if it constitutes a half truth or effectively omits or conceals a material fact, provided it is made with the intent to defraud.

A representation is material if it has a natural tendency to influence or is capable of influencing the decision of the person or entity to which it is addressed.

The word "willfully," as that term has been used from time to time in these instructions, means that the act was committed voluntarily and purposely, with the specific intent to do something the law forbids; that is to say, with bad purpose either to disobey or disregard the law.

It connotes a higher degree of criminal spent than knowingly. Knowingly requires proof of knowledge of facts that constitute the offense. Willfully requires proof that a defendant acted with knowledge that his conduct violated the law.

It is not necessary that the government prove all

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the details alleged in the indictment concerning the precise nature and purpose of the scheme. What must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant knowingly devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises that was substantially the same as the one alleged in the indictment.

It is also not necessary that the government prove that the material transmitted by wire communications was itself false or fraudulent, or that the use of the interstate wire communications facilities was intended as the specific or exclusive means of accomplishing the alleged fraud.

What must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt is the use of the interstate wire communication facilities was closely related to the scheme because the defendant either wired something or caused it to be wired in interstate commerce in an attempt to execute or carry out the scheme.

The alleged scheme need not actually succeed in defrauding anyone.

To cause interstate wire communications facilities to be used is to do an act with knowledge that the use of the wire communications facilities will follow in the ordinary course of business or where such use can reasonably be foreseen.

1	"Financial institution" means a depository
2	institution insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance
3	Corporation.
4	A scheme to defraud affects a financial
5	institution if it exposes the financial institution to a new
6	or increased risk of loss. A financial institution need not
7	have actually suffered a loss in order to have been affected
8	by the scheme. The mere utilization of a financial
9	institution in the transfer of funds does not affect a
10	financial institution.
11	In determining whether or not a defendant acted
12	with criminal intent to defraud or deceive, you may consider
13	whether or not the defendant had a good faith belief that
14	what he or she was doing was legal.
15	If you have a reasonable doubt as to whether or
16	not the defendant had a good faith belief that what he or
17	she was doing was legal, you must acquit the defendant and
18	say by your verdict of not guilty.
19	Count II: Conspiracy to commit securities fraud.
20	The defendants are charged in Count II of the indictment
21	with conspiracy to commit the offense of securities fraud in
22	violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349 and
23	Section 1348.
24	Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349, makes
25	it a crime for two or more persons to conspire to commit the

1 offense of securities fraud.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The elements of the crime of securities under

Title 18, United States Code, Section 1348, are explained to
you below. You are directed to read those instructions on
securities fraud before reaching a decision as to Count II.

A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to join together to accomplish some unlawful purpose. It is a kind of partnership in crime in which each member of the conspiracy becomes the agent of every other member.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, or to find a defendant guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the government has proposed each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt.

That the defendant, and at least one other person, agreed to commit the crime of securities fraud as charged in the indictment. That the defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the agreement. That the defendant joined in it willfully, that is, with the intent to further the unlawful purpose.

One may become a member of a conspiracy without knowing all the details of the unlawful scheme or the identities of all the other alleged conspirators.

If a defendant understands the unlawful nature of a plan or scheme and knowingly and intentionally joins in

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that plan or scheme on one occasion, that is sufficient to
convict him or her for conspiracy, even though the defendant
had not participated before, and even though the defendant
played only a minor part.

The government does not need to prove that the alleged conspirators entered into any formal agreement or that they directly stated between themselves all the details of the scheme.

Likewise, the government does not need proof that all of the details of the scheme alleged in the indictment were actually agreed upon and carried out. Nor must it prove that all the persons alleged to have been members of the conspiracy were such, or that the alleged conspirators actually succeeded in accomplishing their unlawful objectives.

The mere presence at the scene of an event, even with knowledge that a crime is being committed, or the mere fact that certain persons may have been associated with each other and may have assembled together and discussed common aims and interests, does not necessarily establish proof of the existence of a conspiracy.

Also, a person who has no knowledge of a conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which advances some purpose, does not thereby become a conspirator.

As I have told you, whether your verdict is guilty

1 or not guilty, it must be unanimous.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Count II of the indictment accuses the defendants of committing the crime or conspiracy to commit securities fraud by entering into an agreement to knowingly accomplish two unlawful objectives.

The first is to enter into an agreement to knowingly accomplish a scheme to defraud a person in connection with UDF III, UDF IV, UDF V securities.

The second is to enter into an agreement to knowingly accomplish a scheme to obtain by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, any money and property in connection with purchase or sale of securities.

The government need not prove that the alleged conspirators entered into any agreement to knowingly accomplish both unlawful objectives for you to return a guilty verdict on this charge.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the alleged conspirators entered into an agreement to knowingly accomplish at least one of the unlawful objectives charged in Count II is enough.

But in order to return a guilty verdict, all of you must agree that the same unlawful objective was agreed upon by the alleged conspirators.

All of you must agree that the government proved

States Code, Section 2(a).

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant agreed to enter 2 into a scheme to defraud or all of you must agree that the 3 government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the 4 defendant agreed to enter into a scheme to obtain money or 5 property or all of you must agree that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed both 6 7 acts. I will now lay out the substantive elements for 8 9 securities fraud. Counts III through X charge the 10 defendants with knowingly executing or attempting to execute 11 a scheme to defraud holders of securities or aiding and abetting this offense, in violation of Title 18, United 12

The crime of committing or attempting to commit securities fraud can be shown in either of the following two ways: One, Title 18, United States Code, Section 1348(1) makes it a federal crime or offense for anyone to knowingly execute or attempt to execute a scheme or artifice to defraud any person in connection with any security of an issuer of a class of securities registered under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or of an issuer that is required to file reports under that act.

Or two, Title 18, United States Code, Section

1348(2) makes it a federal crime for anyone to knowingly

execute or attempt to execute a scheme or artifice of fraud

by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations,
or promises any money or property in connection with the
purchase or sale of any commodity for future delivery or any
option on a commodity for future delivery or any security of
an issuer with a class of securities registered under the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or that is required to file
reports under that act.
I will now discuss the two alternative ways of
committing or attempting to commit securities fraud.
Section 1348(1), the defendants can be found
guilty of securities fraud, in violation of Title 18, United
States Code, Section 1348(1) only if each of the following
three elements is proven beyond a reasonable doubt:
First, that the defendants knowingly executed or
attempted to execute a scheme or artifice to defraud a
person in connection with UDF III or UDF V securities as
identified in the respective count of the indictment.
Second, that the defendants did so with the intent
to defraud.
And third, that UDF III or UDF V, as identified in
the respective count of the indictment, was an issuer that
registered its securities under Section 12 of the Securities
Exchange Act of 1934, or was otherwise required to file
reports under Section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act
of 1934

1 The defendants can be found Section 1348(2). 2 guilty of securities fraud in violation of Title 18, United 3 States Code, Section 1348(2), only if each of the following 4 four elements is proven beyond a reasonable doubt: 5 First, that the defendants knowingly executed or attempted to execute a scheme or artifice to obtain money or 6 property by means of materially false or fraudulent 7 8 pretenses, representations, or promises. 9 Second, that the defendants executed or attempted 10 to execute their scheme in connection with the purchase or 11 sale of UDF III or UDF V securities as identified in the 12 respective count of the indictment. 13 Third, that the defendants acted with an intent to 14 defraud. 15 And fourth, that UDF III or UDF V., as identified in the respective count of the indictment, was an issuer 16 17 that registered its securities under Section 12 of the 18 Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or was otherwise required to 19 file reports under Section 15(d) of the Securities Act of 20 1934. 21 To find the defendants guilty of committing or 22 attempting to commit securities fraud, you need find only 23 that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt each 24 element of either Section 1348(1) or Section 1248(2).

As previously explained, although the indictment

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

may charge the defendants with committing an offense in several ways by using the word "and," it is not necessary for the government to prove the defendants did each of the things named in the indictment.

It is sufficient the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant did one of the alternative acts as charged; however, you must unanimously agree on which act the defendant committed.

The following definitions may help you in your deliberations. The term "security" means any note, stock, treasury stock, bond, debenture, certificate of interest, or participation in any profit sharing agreement or, in general, any instrument commonly known as a security or any certificate of interest or participation in temporary or interim certificate for, receipt for, or warrant, or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing.

The phrase "in connection with any security,"
means that the scheme and artifice to defraud described in
the indictment must have had some relationship to or have
been connected to a security.

The term "in connection with the purchase or sale of any security" means that the alleged fraudulent conduct occurred in some phase of a transaction involving the purchase or sale of a security.

The government need not show, however, that the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant or anyone associated with him or her bought or sold any such securities.

A "scheme to defraud" means any plan, pattern,

A "scheme to defraud" means any plan, pattern, or course of action intended to deprive another of money or property or bring about some financial gain to the person engaged in the scheme.

An "intent to defraud" means a conscious, knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone. A representation is false if it is known to be untrue or is made with reckless indifference as to its truth or falsity.

A representation would be false if it constitutes a half truth or effectively omits or conceals a material fact, provided it is made with the intent to defraud.

A representation is material if it has a natural tendency to influence or is capable of influencing the decision of the person or entity to which it is addressed.

The term "affiliate" means a person that directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by or is under common control with the issuer.

The word "control" means the possession, direct or indirect, of the power to direct or cause the direction of management and policies of a person, whether through ownership of voting securities, by contract, or otherwise.

The guilt of a defendant in a criminal case may be

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

established without proof that the defendant personally did
every act constituting the offense alleged.

The law recognizes that, ordinarily, anything a person can do for himself may also be accomplished by him through the direction of another person as his or her agent or by in concert with, or under the direction of another person or persons in a joint effort or enterprise.

If another person is acting under the direction of the defendant or if the defendant joins another person and performs acts with the intent to commit a crime, then the law holds the defendant responsible for the acts and conduct of such other persons just as though the defendant had committed the acts or engaged in such conduct.

Before any defendant may be held criminally responsible for the acts of others, it is necessary that the accused deliberately associate himself in some way with the crime and participate in it with the intent to bring about the crime.

Mere presence at the scene of a crime and knowledge that a crime is being committed are not sufficient to establish that a defendant either directed or aided and abetted the crime, unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was a participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

In other words, you may not find any defendant

guilty unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt that every
element of the offense, as defined in these instructions was
committed by some person or persons, and that the defendant
voluntarily participated in its commission with the intent
to violate the law.
For you to find a defendant guilty of this crime,
you must be convinced that the government has proved each of
the following beyond a reasonable doubt:
First, that the offense of securities fraud, as
charged in Counts III through X of the indictment, was
committed by some person.
Second, that the defendant associated with the
criminal venture.
Third, that the defendant purposefully
participated in the criminal venture.
And fourth, that the defendant sought by action to
make the venture successful.
"To associate with the criminal venture," means
that the defendant shared the criminal intent of the
principal. This element cannot be established if the
defendant had no knowledge of the principal's criminal
venture.
"To participate in the criminal venture means the
defendant engaged in some affirmative conduct designed to
aid the venture or to assist the principal of the crime.

A conspirator is responsible for offenses
committed by another conspirator if the conspirator was a
member of the conspiracy when the offense was committed and
if the offense was committed in furtherance of and as a
foreseeable consequence of the conspiracy.

Therefore, if you have first found the defendant

Therefore, if you have first found the defendant guilty of either the conspiracy charged in Counts I or II, and if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that during the time the defendant was a member of that conspiracy, another conspirator committed the offenses in Count III through X, both in furtherance of and as a foreseeable consequence of that conspiracy, then you may find the defendant guilty of the offenses charged in Counts III through X, even though the defendant may not have participated in any of the acts which constitute the offense described in Counts III through X.

To reach a verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, all of you must agree. Your verdict must be unanimous as to each count of the indictment.

Your deliberations will be secret. You will never have to explain your verdict to anyone. It is your duty to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach an agreement, if you can do so.

Each of you must decide the case for yourselves, but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence

decision in any way.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with your fellow jurors.

Do not let any bias, sympathy, or prejudice that

you may feel toward one side or the other influence your

In particular, do not let racial, ethnic, national origin, or other bias influence your decision in any way.

During your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinions and change your mind if convinced that you were wrong.

But do not give up your honest beliefs as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember, at all times, you are judges, judges of the facts. Your duty is to decide whether the government has proved each defendant individually guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

When you go to the jury room, the first thing that you should do is select one of your number as your foreperson who will help guide your deliberation and speak for you here in the courtroom.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience. The foreperson will write the unanimous answer of the jury in the space provided for each count of the indictment, either guilty or not guilty.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the conclusion of your deliberations, the foreperson should date and sign the verdict. If you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, your foreperson should write the message and give it to our court security officer. I will either reply in writing or bring you into the courtroom and answer your message. Bear in mind that you are not to reveal to any person, not even to me, how the jury stands numerically or otherwise on any count of the indictment until after you have reached a unanimous verdict, and I will sign this form. Then the balance of the charge is the verdict And they're self-explanatory, and they go through forms. each count of the indictment, Counts I through X, and you will see, and I will just read this first one for you here. Count I: We, the jury, find the defendant, Hollis Morrison Greenlaw, "blank" as to Count I of the indictment. You will answer either not guilty or guilty. The second question: We, the jury, find the defendant, Benjamin Lee Wissink, "blank" as to Count I of the indictment. You will answer not guilty or guilty. The next question is: We, the jury, find the defendant, Cara Delin Obert, "blank" as to Count I of the indictment. You will answer not quilty or quilty. And the next question asks: We, the jury, find the defendant, Jeffrey Brandon Jester, "blank" as to Count I

1	of the indictment. Answer not guilty or guilty.
2	And then there's a follow-up question that asks:
3	If you find the defendants guilty of Count I, did you
4	find and it really should say, if you find "any" of the
5	defendants if you find any of the defendants guilty of
6	Count I, did you find that the scheme to defraud affected a
7	financial institution? And you will answer yes or no in the
8	space that is provided for you.
9	And then the same process applies to Count II.
10	You answer the same questions as related to Count No. II.
11	Count No. III. Count No. IV. Count No. V. Count No. VI.
12	Count No. VII. Count No. VIII. Count No. VIIII. And Count
13	No. X.
14	And on that form at the very bottom, you'll see,
15	or your presiding juror will see, there's a space for your
16	presiding juror to sign and a space for him to date the jury
17	charge. Okay.
18	All right. Well, that took a little longer than I
19	thought it would, so we're running a little late, but we
20	will get started.
21	Ms. Eggers.
22	MS. EGGERS: Thank you. May it please the Court,
23	Counsel.
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MS. EGGERS: Ladies and gentlemen, one of the

1 first instructions Judge O'Connor gave you a few minutes ago 2 on page 2 was something that we talked about last Wednesday. 3 And that is, that a jury may never be allowed to consider 4 bias, prejudice, or sympathy. 5 Y'all might remember last Wednesday we talked about Lady Justice and she has the blindfold on. 6 7 closing argument I give, I always bring this instruction up, because I've heard, after the fact, a lot of times people 8 9 say, "Well, you know what, government, you proved beyond all 10 reasonable doubt, but we felt sorry for someone," or "We 11 felt sympathetic for someone." 12 This instruction is in there. And actually, Judge 13 O'Connor actually talked about it twice. So I ask that, 14 when y'all go back behind that door and you start 15 deliberating, if at any time somebody says, "Yeah, you know what, the government proved it beyond a reasonable doubt, 16 17 but I feel sorry for somebody," that one of you raise your 18 hand, and say, "Wait a second. Judge O'Connor gave us this 19 instruction right here on page 2. We can't do that." 20 The same thing, another instruction Judge O'Connor gave you, and it was brought up last Wednesday as well, is 21 22 that a jury in federal court is never permitted to consider 23 punishment, the question of punishment. That instruction is 24 in there and Judge O'Connor instructed you on it.

behind that door and you start deliberating, if at any point somebody says, "You know what, each of those elements were proven beyond a reasonable doubt, but I don't want to see somebody get in trouble. I don't want to see somebody get punished." I ask that you raise your hand and say, "Wait a second. Judge O'Connor said we can't do that. We can't consider punishment."

Now, Judge O'Connor, he is the one that gives you the law, and he went through all the various elements and you will have the jury instructions. Count I, again, is conspiracy to commit wire fraud affecting a financial institution.

In conspiracy, you will see Count II is conspiracy as well. So Counts I and II, they actually, for the conspiracy aspects of it, they have generally the same elements. There's three elements: That the defendant, and at least one other person, agreed to commit the crime, for Count I, it's wire fraud; two, that the defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the agreement; and three, that the defendant willfully joined in it, that is, with the unlawful purpose to further the unlawful purpose of the scheme.

So as Judge O'Connor explained, if somebody is charged with conspiracy -- well, since they're charged with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, you need to know the elements of what wire fraud are.

Before we get to that, though, with regards to
conspiracy, I hope nobody thought it was going to be like
TV, that there was going to be some email that was going to
be flashed upon the screen that was going to say, "We've got
this unlawful agreement, we're going to do this crime."
That's not how this works.
Under conspiracy law, one may become a member of a
conspiracy without knowing all the details of the unlawful
scheme. If the defendant understands the unlawful nature of
the plan or scheme and intentionally joins in on it in one
occasion, that is enough for conspiracy.
I gave that crazy example of Ms. Jones,
Miss Lyons, and I getting involved in a conspiracy to rob a
bank. That's a conspiracy. What y'all see here is a
conspiracy.

The government does not need to prove any formal agreement. Again, I hope you didn't expect that there was going to be some email, where it says, "Yes, let's go commit securities fraud tomorrow." That's just not how this works.

The government does not need to prove that all the details were actually agreed upon or carried out when charged with conspiracy. The government does not have to prove that all the persons alleged in the conspiracy are actually members, but we did.

Each of these four defendants, you heard evidence

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concerning each of them. And further, the government does
not have to prove that the alleged conspirators actually
succeeded, but we did.

Remember that hypothetical with me robbing the bank, going inside and somebody catching me right as I came out? We reached that agreement on the front end. Even if I got caught coming out the door, we reached that agreement.

So the elements -- what is wire fraud? To know whether or not somebody -- whether or not we've met the elements of conspiracy, we've got to figure out what wire fraud is. That the defendants knowingly devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud the investing public or shareholders of UDF III, IV, or V.

Now, the evidence has shown that starting, at least as early as January 2011, these defendants realized there was not enough money coming in. They realized, and you were able to see it in that big chart, 410, they realized that in order to keep those distributions going, that, they were going have to pull the money from somewhere else. We know it started at least as early as January of 2011.

Why? Why did they do it? Because they didn't have to. It was made very clear that there was no promise to pay distributions. They were not required to pay distributions. But they all knew good and well that, if

1	they didn't pay money to those earlier investors, you
2	wouldn't get subsequent investors.

Number two, that the scheme to defraud employed false material misrepresentations. The defendants did not tell UDF III investors there wasn't enough cash from operations to pay the distributions. The defendants did not tell UDF IV's would-be investors that their money was going to be used to issue loans so distributions could be paid to earlier investors in III.

The defendants did not tell UDF III's investors that there was not enough money to even pay its own Legacy Texas Bank loan. The defendants told UDF Vs would-be investors that it would not engage in affiliate transactions.

The defendants did not tell UDF V's would-be investors that their money was going to be used to issue loans so that distributions could be paid to those earlier investors. That's nowhere in those SEC files.

Number three, for wire fraud, that the defendant transmitted or caused to be transmitted by wire, interstate commerce, any writing for the purpose of executing this scheme.

And y'all are probably wondering why we had poor Ms. Tidwell come all the way in here and talk about her uploading SEC documents to a company in New York City.

1 Well, for wire fraud, there actually has to be an interstate 2 transmission of some sort. You heard the number of ways. You heard 3 4 Mr. Vlasak, there are wires that were from DST that included 5 investors' money. The wires that were to DST that included investors' money. Wires from financial institutions. 6 7 the emails at UDF. Emails which are wires to the company in New York that she helped upload and do the web browsing, and 8 9 then uploading the SEC files themselves. That has been 10 shown beyond all doubt. 11 Fourth element of wire fraud, that the defendant acted with the specific intent to defraud. They did not 12 13 tell anyone in those SEC filings the true reason for the 14 advance requests, participations, and refinance that UDF IV 15 was doing with UDF III. Had they disclosed the real reason all those 16 17 participation, advance requests, and refinances were being 18 done, what person would want to put their money in UDF IV? 19 They did not tell anyone in the SEC filings that 20 UDF III did not have enough money to pay its own 1.25 million quarterly payment. 21 22 They did not tell anyone in the SEC about that 23 pitch, that pitch that Blake Buffington and Tom Buffington 24 and James Dorney were given.

The defendants went out of their way, when they

1 created UDF V., they went out of their way to make it as 2 though that one was going to be different. 3 The March 2014 manipulated spreadsheet that 4 auditors were informed was based upon executed contracts. 5 There was a lot going on back and forth in here about whether or not it had to have a contract, whether or not it 6 didn't. 7 But Government's Exhibit 96 shows you what the 8 9 auditors were led to believe back in March of 2014, that 10 those were based on executed contracts. The June 2014 manipulated spreadsheet being given 11 12 to this third-party company, Navigant. Look at that email. 13 Navigant is a third-party company. They're still continuing 14 to send this manipulated spreadsheet. 15 They cannot tell the board of directors for UDF V. You heard Mr. Kahane. The uncontroverted evidence is that 16 17 Mr. Kahane said he did not know about all these illegal 18 transactions. 19 What is wire fraud? Affecting a financial 20 institution. As Judge O'Connor explained, after you go through the elements of wired fraud, one of the questions 21 22 that's going to be on the verdict form -- or conspiracy to 23 commit wire fraud is whether or not the scheme affected a

You heard that Veritex Bank, Capital Bank, Legacy

24

25

financial institution.

1	Texas Bank, all of those banks relied on the SEC filings,
2	all of them.
3	You heard about them trying to add to the UDF V
4	borrowing base at Prosperity Bank. There's the exhibit for
5	that.
6	You heard about the late payments to Legacy Texas
7	Bank. You saw those exhibits and the summary exhibits. You
8	saw the late payments to Prosperity Bank. You saw the late
9	payments to Independent Bank.
L0	All of that evidence is before you and that's why
L1	the defendants are guilty of Count I, conspiracy to commit
L2	wire fraud affecting a financial institution.
L3	Judge O'Connor went through a number of
L 4	definitions. And these definition, some of them apply to
L5	both Count I and the remainder of the counts as well. He
L6	read them twice to make sure that you see those definitions
L7	apply.
L8	But a scheme to defraud means a plan, pattern, or
L9	course of action intended to deprive another of money or
20	property and intended to bring about some financial gain to
21	the person engaged in the scheme.
22	Now, Judge O'Connor is very clear, you heard the
23	testimony about the amount of money these defendants
24	received for their involvement with UDF. The only reason

that you're to consider that is for motive. Defendant

1 Greenlaw had significant motive.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A specific intent to defraud means a conscious, knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone.

Other definitions that are included in there is what exactly is "false"? It seems crazy, but only lawyers actually right down what a definition "false" is, but here it is so we know all know.

A representation would be false if it constitutes a half truth or effectively omits or conceals a material fact provided it is made with the intent to defraud.

A reputation is material if it has a natural tendency to or is capable of influencing the decision-maker.

For Counts I and II, the conspiracy counts, there's also a definition of "willfully" involved in there. Counts III through V do not include the word "willfully," but Counts I and II do.

The definition of "willfully" provides that the act was committed voluntarily and purposely with the specific intent to do something the law forbids, that is with bad purpose either to disobey or disregard the law.

Now, for the wire fraud aspect of it. It's not actually required for the government to prove that something false was in the wire communication. That is not required.

The government does not have to prove, as I mentioned before, that the scheme actually succeeded.

1 Now, with regards to that, determining whether or 2 not it affected a financial institution. Ouite a bit was 3 made that the banks were ultimately repaid. No doubt about 4 it. They were. That is not required. 5 All that is required to prove a conspiracy to commit wire fraud affecting a financial institution is that 6 it exposes the financial institution to a new or increased 7 risk of loss. We did not have to show that they lost one 8 9 dollar. 10 All we had to show was that it exposed the 11 financial institution to a new or increased risk of loss. The financial institution need not have actually 12 suffered a loss at all. That's Count I, ladies and 13 14 gentlemen, and the defendants are guilty of Count I. 15 Count II, conspiracy to commit securities fraud. You'll notice that the same elements apply to conspiracy 16 17 commit securities fraud. 18 And then once you get to that, just like with the 19 conspiracy to commit wire fraud, you can see one of those 20 elements of securities fraud to know whether or not they 21 actually engaged in conspiracy. 22 As Judge O'Connor explained, there are two ways

23

24

1 But it's to knowingly execute or attempt to 2 execute a scheme or artifice to defraud any person in 3 connection with any security. 4 The second way is to knowingly execute or attempt 5 to execute a scheme or artifice -- and I, again, underlined and made it yellow -- to obtain by means of false or 6 7 fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, any money or property in connection with the sale or purchase. 8 9 Two different ways. We only have to prove one, 10 and y'all do need to agree upon whichever way, or both, that we've proven it. I would submit that we've proven it both 11 12 ways. 13 The elements for securities fraud. Just like wire 14 fraud, there's -- I like to call it like a recipe. 15 don't have everything that goes into the cake, that cake is not going to rise. So we have to prove each of these 16 17 elements beyond a reasonable doubt for securities fraud 18 under subparagraph 1. 19 That the defendants knowingly executed or 20 attempted to execute an artifice to defraud a person in 21 connection with UDF III or IV securities as shown in each 22 count. 23 You'll see that each count of the substantive 24 counts concerns an SEC filing for various years, either a

25

10-K or a 10-Q.

1 Number two that the defendant so with the intent 2 And number three, that the securities were to defraud. 3 registered. 4 I don't think there's going to be any dispute here 5 that these securities were registered. So I don't think that's where the dispute's going to be. 6 7 Elements for subparagraph two. Again, that the defendants knowingly executed or attempted to execute or 8 9 obtained money or property by means of material, false 10 pretenses, representations, or promises. That they did it 11 in connection with the security, either III or V, as there That the defendants did so with the 12 in the indictment. 13 intent to defraud. And that, again, the securities were 14 registered. 15 So when you break those down, between subparagraph one and subparagraph two of securities fraud, 16 17 it's basically whether or not we proved that they engaged in 18 a scheme or artifice to defraud in connection -- or to 19 defraud a person in connection with UDF III or V. Or, under 20 subparagraph two, that they engaged in a scheme or artifice

So what do we have? What's our evidence for this?

We have, again, those same things I pointed out
earlier. They did not tell anyone in the SEC filings the
true reason for the advance request participations. They

21

22

23

24

25

to obtain money or property.

1 didn't tell anyone in the SEC filings they didn't have 2 enough money to make their own loan payments. All those 3 things I pointed out earlier. 4 They went out of their way to tell the investing 5 public, V is going to be different. They made that decision. Nothing required them to do that, but y'all heard 6 why they did. They did because they needed to open it up to 7 other groups like Cetera. 8 9 Some definitions. Again, there's a number of 10 definitions that is used in this part of the charge as well. So I'm not going to re-go over those, but you heard Judge 11 O'Connor read some of them. And that was the definition of 12 13 an "affiliate." 14 I expect there's going to be argument by defense 15 counsel saying this is sort of a mushy kind of thing, people have different opinions. You read the definition that 16 17 Judge O'Connor gives you. 18 The term "affiliate" means a person that, directly 19 or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls 20 or is controlled by, or is under common control with the 21 issuer. 22 The word "control" means the possession, direct or 23 indirect, of the power to direct or cause the direction of 24 management and policies of a person, whether through

ownership of voting securities -- and then I underlined "by

1 contract."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They had it written into the contracts that they made the decision. They could decide what loans to draw on. They made that decision. And by doing that, they made themselves affiliates with Centurion and Buffington.

Now, each of the counts, as I mentioned -- and you'll see there's a -- the substantive counts, you'll see in the indictment there's a chart for Counts III through X. And that chart in each of them describes what the act and execution of that scheme or that count is.

So, for instance, for Count III, you'll see that the date -- that date is going to be the date that the SEC filing was submitted to the SEC. And the act or the falsity in that particular SEC filing was causing Fund III to report -- which fund -- we don't have to use generic names -- so UDF III to report to public investors through it's 2014 10-K, that's that annual filing, false and misleading information concerning the source of funds used to pay distributions and the Bank Loan 6. That's the Legacy Texas Bank loan.

Y'all remember there was that nomenclature summary chart? And this is where you're going to have to, unfortunately, use it because of the way we have to write the names.

So there's two ways that they lied in that one.

One, how they were going to repay Legacy Texas Bank's loan.

And number two, where their distribution for money was

3 | actually coming from.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You'll see -- and you've got the bank records for Legacy Texas Bank, and you've also got a summary chart. They only make four payments, even though they're supposed to be made quarterly. And you can look at the underlying documentation, you can trace the money looking at the bank accounts and looking at the wires in and wires out. And by doing so, you will be able to see that the money came from, not UDF III, even though they were telling the investing public that's what they were going to do.

Count IV -- and again, each of these has its own, but Count IV concerns UDF V's 10-K for that same time period. And in that particular one, this one, false and misleading information concerns the loans originated and funded by UDF V, while concealing that the loans were made to developments that had previously obtained loans from an earlier fund entity and that UDF V loans were used to pay off loans from that earlier fund entity.

And in that, you can look at the various pages of the SEC filing. So you would go to that particular 10-K. For instance, on page 7 it explained their investment objectives. And nowhere in there does it say loaning money to III, IV, to pay off their loans so we can pay

1 distributions to earlier investors.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And also we have, "We will not make loans to participate in real estate investments with, or provide credit enhancements for our affiliates."

And then there's that allocation policy at page 455 and all those shall nots that they told the investing public that they would not do.

And then 412 is a summary exhibit. And you heard the testimony about how the money was used from UDF V's investors to fund these other loans.

Count V was filed on May 15, 2015. And that is the 10-Q for the UDF III. Again, the false and misleading information concerning the source of the funds to pay distributions and the fact that it did not indicate the Bank 6 loan was concealing that funds were dry from investors in UDF IV.

Defense counsel made a big deal, big deal about -I think it was Government's Exhibit 420. Special Agent -or excuse me, Forensic Accountant Martinez didn't consider
the fact that in 420, UDF IV had enough money in other bank
accounts. Well, that's in the bank records. It's right
there plain as day. But the defendants are still the ones
that made the decision to get money from a wholly different
entity to fund that.

They made that decision. Why? Don't know. But

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by UDF V's investors.

on Government's Exhibit 420, they made that decision. This is another 10-0. Count VI. This is a 10-0 for UDF V. And the falsity is concealing. Again, those loans were made to developments that had previously obtained loans from an earlier entity. Count VII. This concerns -- again, this concerns UDF III. And the false and misleading information concerns Legacy Texas Bank again and then also the information concerning the source of funds to pay distributions. They had multiple opportunities to tell the investing public, "Hey, we don't have quite enough money right now. We're going to get a loan from one of our other funds, and we're going to pay off this UDF III loan, so we can pay back these earlier investors' money." They didn't do that. They made the decision not to do that. Count VIII. Again, this is concerning UDF V. And in this particular one as well it's the fact that they weren't disclosing UDF V loans that were being used and paid out like that just so the distributions could be going to UDF III. Count VIIII, concerns the 10-Q filed November 16. And the same type of thing, the distributions, where the money was coming from. And then also the fact that Legacy Texas Bank was not able to be paid. It was now being paid

I urge you to look at the summary exhibits and 1 2 look at the back-up documentation. And on that December 9, it is a mad scramble. 3 Alice Anne Brown, bright and early December 9, she starts 4 5 emailing the defendants that agreed they would be paid by December 9 -- or before December 10. 6 7 And if you look at those emails, you're going to see Defendant Wissink, he does the same thing he'd been 8 9 doing every month before. The same thing he did in those 10 other 60, along with his other co-conspirators, he starts figuring out, "Where are we going to do a draw from? We've 11 got to get that money." Their friend, Mr. Etter, had just 12 13 said the week before that they didn't have the money to pay. 14 Government's Exhibit 577, that's uncontroverted 15 evidence that Mr. Etter said on that phone on that day, on December 3, "We didn't expect to make that payment either 16 17 and we don't have the money to pay it." 18 And then finally, Count X. Count X is the SEC 19 filings for UDF V and now -- because they are now -- also 20 UDF V is being used to pay distributions to the UDF III 21 investors. It has both the loans, the information, lack of

This chart, it's sort of all in one place,

information, false information about the UDF V loans, but

also they're not disclosing that they used money prior to

that filing to pay UDF III's investors.

22

23

24

1 Government's Exhibit 413. This chart shows the times that 2 those UDF V investors, the people, the men and women that 3 were told there wouldn't be any affiliate transactions. This shows all the occasions with UDF V where their money 4 5 was used. UDF IV, those SEC filings, they acknowledge they 6 7 were going to do them there. Now, they didn't tell the investing public that we're going to do -- we're going to do 8 9 affiliate transactions so we can pay UDF III. They never 10 said that, because they knew if they said that kind of 11 thing, who would invest in UDF V? But here are the occasions in Government's 12 13 Exhibit 413 when UDF V's money was used. 14 When Mr. Greenlaw testified, he didn't say 15 anything about that other member of the board of directors, Mr. Kahane. 16 17 You heard Mr. Kahane say that he understood that 18 UDF V would not do affiliate transactions. You heard 19 Mr. Kahane say, if an affiliated transaction were to occur, 20 it must be considered by the board. You heard Mr. Kahane say that affiliate transactions must be disclosed. 21 The 22 parties have to be identified by name, their relationship 23 has to be described. The transaction has to be described 24 carefully and distinctly. 25 You heard Mr. Kahane say he would have considered

1 money going from UDF V to UDF III to pay investors to be an 2 affiliate transaction and he would not have approved it. You heard him say he would have considered money 3 going from UDF V to pay the UDF III bank loan to be an 4 5 affiliated transaction and he would not have approved it. You heard him say he would have considered money 6 7 going from V to retire a UDF IV loan to be an affiliated transaction and he would not have approved it. 8 9 I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, go through 10 Government's Exhibits 350, 349, go through them. We didn't sit here and go through all those pages and pages of emails, 11 but I urge you to do that. And when you look at the 12 13 chronology, each one, it's going to go something like this. 14 Mr. Vlasak who's on that, the other guy by the 15 name of Sanchez, and I think there was a female at one They sent an email to the UDF folks. It goes, "Hey, 16 point. 17 this much ACH. This much cash has got to be funded." 18 And then what you'll see is the mad scramble to 19 either issue a paper to do an advance request, or figure out 20 some way to get the money over into a UDF III bank account. I ask you to read the emails. 21 22 Look at Government's Exhibit 410 which puts all 23 those 350 through 409 in one place. 24 Ladies and gentlemen, we're not here because 25 Mr. Martinez traced it and it only happened like five or six

times. We're not here because he traced it happening like
10 or 20 times. He traced the same thing happening 53 out
of 60 times. And that is money coming from a subsequent
investor in order to pay distributions to somebody that had
invested before them.

Look at the things that they were doing beyond just using investors' money. Covering Greenlaw's margin account. And this is at Government's Exhibit 414 that sort of goes across the screen. UDF paying UDF I's Veritex loan. UDF paying UDF III's Legacy loan. UDF IV's Capital Bank loan paying UDF III's Veritex loan. And UDF V, ultimately, on December 9, paying UDF III's Legacy loan.

One of the instructions Judge O'Connor gave you is direct and circumstantial evidence. Read that. It goes back to sort of what I brought up on the front end on Wednesday. This is not television. I like those shows, all of them, but it's not. And you're not to consider any distinction between direct and circumstantial. They're treated the same. And that's one of the instructions that Judge O'Connor gave you.

So what do we have here? Some of the evidence.

We have Blake Buffington's testimony that on September 3 and then on October 17, there was a sales pitch given by that man right there. And in that sales pitch, that man said,

"The way to move forward" -- "the path forward is we'll take

1 y'all's loans in I and III and IV and we'll roll them into 2 V. That's the path forward." James Dorney's testimony, because he wasn't at the 3 second meeting, but he was at the first. Matt Parker's 4 5 testimony, the spreadsheet notifying the SEC of what he'd Casey Ford's testimony that, each time a distribution 6 7 was needed, there ended up being some backroom conversations over there at Centurion. 8 9 Tyson Walters' testimony that each time they 10 needed a distribution an advance request was done. 11 then, again, I go back to, read the emails. Please read 12 them. 13 Some of the arguments just hearing the 14 cross-examination in this case that I expect may be made or 15 some takeaways might be, well, the developers' loans were ultimately paid off. 16 Judge O'Connor just read the jury instructions to 17 18 you and you will have a copy of them. Nowhere in the law in the United States of America or in the instructions that you 19 20 were given does it say that that is a defense when wire

The banks got paid back eventually. Nowhere in the jury instructions does that say, oh, no harm, no foul. The person's not guilty if the bank didn't lose a dollar. Nowhere.

Northern District of Texas Ft. Worth Division

fraud or securities fraud is committed. Doesn't matter.

21

22

23

24

1 It was suggested it was a good deal for the 2 developers. I'm not really sure how refinancing a loan from V -- that was at IV is a good deal when the interest rate is 3 the same, but okay. Sounded like a good deal for UDF III's 4 5 investors, though, for them to get their 9.75 distribution. But even if it was a good deal for the developers, that is 6 not a defense. 7 It was a good working environment. No doubt. 8 Ιt 9 sounded like a lot of people really did and still do enjoy 10 working there. But ladies and gentlemen, that is not 11 relevant. That is not a defense. 12 Nowhere in the jury instructions does it say, 13 "Well, if everybody enjoys their job, it's not a crime." 14 I had an error here. It's Government's 15 Exhibit 429. That's that summary exhibit. So when you get the indictment, you can go through and -- you know, you can 16 17 write on the indictment if you want so you can figure out 18 which entity is which entity. 19 You'll see in the beginning of the indictment, 20 there's a lot of descriptive information about financial institutions, bank account numbers, the organizational 21 charts of these different UDF entities. You only heard a 22 23 couple of them named, but there's a lot of UDF entities 24 listed there, and you'll need that chart for that. 25 One thing I think's very telling is to do a

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

comparison of UDF III and IV versus UDF V. In UDF III and IV, there was no promise to avoid affiliate transactions in the SEC filings, funds moved between III and IV, and every one of them agreed that it was permissible.

V, there was a promise in the SEC disclosures that they would not engage in the transactions, money moved from V to IV and III, but the defendants now still argue the same thing they were doing before is okay.

I go back, ladies and gentlemen, to something I started with. And that is, you must not be influenced by bias, prejudice, or sympathy, and you can't consider the sentence in this case, or punishment.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to listen to the closing arguments of defense counsel. When they start talking about, "Oh, somebody's such a nice person" or anything that might tug at your heartstrings, go back to page 2 of the jury instructions. You can't do that.

It's not television. Just -- in the United States of America, just because somebody wants something really bad or just because somebody has done something good in the past in their life, just because something starts off as a good idea, no doubt, it sounded like it was a great idea.

The defendants in this case, at a certain point, that good idea started running out and they started having to take money from investors in UDF IV so that they could

1	keep on paying UDF III. And when that money started running
2	out, they started taking UDF V investors' money.
3	Ladies and gentlemen, this is a Ponzi-like scheme.
4	They were taking money from later investors so they could
5	pay distributions to earlier investors. They can sugarcoat
6	it all they want, but that's what it is.
7	And I'm going to ask you to find them guilty of
8	all 10 counts.
9	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, I have a few objections
10	that I would like to take up at sidebar.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	(A sidebar was had.)
13	MR. PELLETIER: Please the Court.
14	THE COURT: Thank you, yes.
15	MR. PELLETIER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen
16	of the Jury. It's been a long short two weeks, and I thank
17	you for your attention during this time. I know they've
18	been long days, but this is, as you know, very important to
19	us.
20	So I started off my original opening statement by
21	telling you that the government got it wrong. And I think
22	the evidence, I believe the evidence showed exactly that.
23	And I'm going to walk you through, not only how the
24	government got it wrong, why they knew they got it wrong.
25	I'm going to focus on the bank evidence, but I'm going to

1 talk about the case -- the entire case. 2 So I don't know -- so the first thing we know, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it's a real business, 3 4 building real communities, real jobs. Operating 5 continuously for 18 years, you know that. And most important, the notion that there was no 6 7 money, that there was some reason to do this because there was no money, or as the prosecutor -- the prosecutor's words 8 9 that they used were, there wasn't enough, or the real 10 reason -- or the real reason they did this, certainly wasn't money, but we'll talk about that. 11 So if it's a real business and a real company, 12 13 what did the prosecutor just tell you? What did she say in 14 opening statement? "I expect the evidence is going to show 15 this is much like a Ponzi scheme." Now, why? Why are you using the words "Ponzi scheme"? Because they're 16 17 inflammatory, right? Because it makes people go, "Oh, my 18 goodness, a Ponzi scheme"? Well, the fact that they believe it's a Ponzi 19 20 scheme is why we're here today. But we know it wasn't. Ιt never was. Why is that why we're here today? 21 22 You heard Agent Martinez -- or excuse me. 23 Mr. Martinez, who's an analyst with the FBI, he said, when 24 they asked for more resources, they told him it's a 25 multi-hundred million- -- he didn't know whether it was a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

billion or hundred million dollar Ponzi scheme, in danger of imminent collapse. We need resources. We have a billion dollar Ponzi scheme here. That's not true. And that predated the search warrant. And then they got a search warrant. And what Nothing. 2017, nothing. happened in 2016? 2018, nothing. This Ponzi scheme, this billion dollar Ponzi scheme is on the verge of collapsing. 2019, what did the government do? Nothing. 2020, five years, nothing. And here we are today, 2021, and now we see what it is. Let's talk about what it is. So first of all, if it were a Ponzi scheme, we would expect to see a front company with no real value, investor money syphoned off by executives, jilted investors, lack of transparency, that quickly collapses upon discovery. And, of course, none of that is present here. What did the evidence show? UDF funds fully deployed. Any -- excuse me. What you didn't hear. Did you hear any UDF employee -- I think I read that wrong. Yes. didn't hear, any UDF employee providing testimony about a criminal scheme. It's not just that they're happy about their jobs. That's not what they said, "I love my job." They said there's no criminal activity going on here. Any credible witness offering evidence of a

criminal scheme? Did any witness come up here, any one, and

1 say there was a criminal scheme? Was there any evidence of 2 misappropriated money? Zero. Any attempt by the government 3 to understand the business economics? Agent Martinez said 4 Why? It's inconvenient. no. 5 Any evidence that the banks were misled or suffered any harm? They paid their interest payments late. 6 7 Well, I'm not so sure that's true. There's a grace period; it's not late. And they did it consistently. Why? Because 8 9 they're a running a business. 10 Any evidence that the investors were misled or 11 suffered harm? No. Any evidence that anyone at UDF 12 intentionally did anything improper? No. 13 Any evidence to corroborate the prosecution's 14 hypotheticals? No. 15 What you did hear, you did hear that UDF funds were fully deployed, collateralized, generating significant 16 17 income. We saw on this front page that I showed you, 18 one billion in invested capital, 1.8 billion in revenue, a 19 Transparent, properly disclosed. real business. 20 conducting business to this day. Fully repaid all bank 21 loans. All investors benefited. 22 UDF provided unfettered access to outside experts 23 after the search warrant. And before, remember when SK 24 Research, "Well, we don't really understand these 25 transactions."

1	"What do you want us to do?"
2	"Would you hire someone?"
3	"Yes."
4	"Who?"
5	"Baker Tilly."
6	Bring them on. Bring them on. Ernst & Young,
7	come on in. Thompson & Knight, you heard Mr. McCormick,
8	come on in. Anything you want to look at, please do.
9	Forensic Risk Alliance, Ernst & Young, we
10	cooperated with the government investigation. Anybody you
11	want to talk to, do. Please do. Ask any question you want.
12	Ask for any document. You got them all. You took every
13	single piece of paper out of their offices.
14	The executives, these people, volunteered to go,
15	"What do you need to know?"
16	"Talk to the government." Did you hear anything
17	about anything they said that was false? What criminals do
18	that?
19	Greenlaw volunteered Mr. Greenlaw volunteered
20	to appear before the grand jury. Who does that? Criminals?
21	No. Not a single dime misappropriated. You didn't hear
22	evidence about one dime that went into someone's pocket that
23	wasn't supposed to be there. Not one.
24	They did the opposite, ladies and gentlemen, of
25	what criminals do.

4.21-01-209-0 Vol 0 January 20, 2022
Now, the judge is going to instruct you and the
judge is going to tell you that we start with a clean slate,
all these defendants. And he already has told you that.
And the law does not require a defendant to prove his or her
innocence or produce any evidence at all.
The government, as you know, has the burden of
proving each defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
Not just a reasonable doubt, beyond a reasonable doubt.
And if it fails to do so, you must acquit any
defendant whose guilt has not been proven beyond a
reasonable doubt.
In determining whether the defendant acted with
criminal intent, if you have reasonable doubt as to whether
the defendant had a good-faith belief that he what he or
she was doing was legal, you must acquit the defendant and
say so by a verdict of not guilty.
They had to have a good faith belief they what
they were doing was right. That's what all the evidence
shows. And when a prosecutor tells you that just because
someone's nice, it's not a defense. Well, the judge is
going to tell you something that's a little bit different
than that.

who said he's known this man for a long time and he has a

reputation for honesty, integrity.

You remember Mr. Greenlaw, we called Mr. Towey,

The judge is going to tell you that that type of evidence, evidence of a defendant's character which is inconsistent of those traits of character ordinarily involved in the commission of a crime charged may, in and of itself, despite what the prosecutor told you, give rise to a reasonable doubt.

The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants had the specific intent that they intended to do what the law forbid. And the judge is going to tell you, has told you, that the mere utilization of a financial institution in the transfer of funds does not affect a financial institution.

Now, let's just talk quickly about the financial institutions. All loans are paid back in full. What the prosecutor called a mad scramble at the end of the month when the bill was due, a mad scramble. I don't think the evidence was that at all.

But anyone who has ever run a business, everyone has always balanced a checkbook, it's to make sure that, at the end of the month, that money is there. It's not a crime, okay, to make sure that -- we heard payroll. Every business in America pulls the money together the day before payroll is due. It's not a crime. It's the way businesses are run. Maybe not the way the government's run, but it's the way businesses are run.

1	And I'm going to go quickly through these. You
2	saw Alice Anne Brown, paid in full. Any negative impact on
3	the bank? No. Mad scramble? Nonsense.
4	Veritex Bank, "Were you repaid on every loan?"
5	"We were totally repaid on every loan."
6	Capital Bank, "Performed as required on the loan?"
7	"Yes."
8	"Totally paid in full, Independent Bank?"
9	"That's right."
10	And how about the investors? How about the
11	investors? UDF performed as they expected. You remember
12	those two government witnesses?
13	"Can you think of any restriction on what UDF III
14	can do with that money once it gets it?"
15	"I don't believe so."
16	"Mr. Haan, would it surprise you that they said
17	they will be making loans to common borrowers?"
18	"It wouldn't surprise me."
19	"So other than the prosecutors telling you the
20	money was simply going to UDF III investors from IV, has
21	anybody else told you that?"
22	"No."
23	Mr. Murphy, the broker/dealer, "Did you know that
24	UDF III, II, IV, and V had common borrowers amongst them?"
25	"Yes."

1	Mr. Breault, "We read all the prospectuses, all of
2	our due diligence, we knew this company. We spent a lot of
3	time" and by the way, just so you know, Mr. Murphy said
4	it took him two years to understand this business. Two
5	years before he would recommend it to his investors. He
6	looked at everything.
7	"And, Mr. Breault, did you buy stock?"
8	"I did."
9	"How much of this stock did you personally buy?"
10	"I personally hold three-quarters-of-a-million
11	dollars."
12	These investors knew what they were buying. And
13	they were there's no way in which they suffered any harm
14	at all.
15	UDF was a real business. We know that. All of
16	these bankers, "Did you go there and look at the
17	properties?"
18	"Yes."
19	"Were they there?"
20	"Yes."
21	"Was it real collateral that you took for your
22	loans?"
23	"Yes."
24	Veritex Bank, "Real land, correct? Real
25	developer?"

1	"Yes."
2	"Did you go look at the properties?"
3	"Yes."
4	Alice Anne Brown, "Did you stand terra firma on
5	these properties?"
6	"No, but I drove by them. They were there."
7	And honesty and integrity, they all told us,
8	"These are people of good character and integrity, that's
9	why we did business with them." Good character and
10	integrity.
11	That works. So what's left? What is left? Mad
12	scramble. Interest payments late. The principal payment's
13	extended, mad scramble. That's not a crime. It never was a
14	crime. Can't be a crime.
15	Here it is, ladies and gentlemen, here's what's
16	left. Remember when Mr. Kahane for the government talks
17	about he wouldn't approve that?
18	The comment said, if anybody ever had told you
19	that the money from investors from V was going to be used to
20	pay distributions to III, would you have considered that to
21	be an affiliated-party transaction?
22	He said, "Yes. Sure. Would have been if it
23	happened that way."
24	And then I said, "Isn't it true that the only
25	person that ever told you that is this prosecutor or the

1 prosecutors in the grand jury and here today?" 2 "Yes." 3 "Okay. Who is that?" 4 "Counsel for U.S. government." 5 They're not witnesses. There was not a single witness who said that, ladies and gentlemen, is indeed an 6 7 affiliated transaction and that these people believed it to That these people believed it to be. 8 9 So even if you believe something of which there's 10 no evidence, the nonsense that it was an affiliated 11 transaction in somebody's opinion that's not a witness, 12 these people have to believe it -- not a scrap. Not a --13 not a piece of paper this big says these people, anyone 14 believed that, anyone. 15 So what did we have here besides that? I want you to remember the testimony of Jeff Breault. "And what did 16 17 you do when you heard there was a search warrant?" 18 "In 35 years, this has never happened to me. 19 Someone that I knew and respected being raided like that. 20 got on a plane and I flew down there. And I don't know why, I just felt like I needed to be there." 21 And remember, he said he introduced himself to the 22 And then I said to him, "Have they ever, ever, ever 23 24 called you since then to talk you? Why did you have such 25 confidence in this company? Why did you have 7,000 of your

1 investors" -- "why did you tell them that this is a good 2 investment?" They didn't ever call him? Why? Why? Because it 3 4 is an inconvenient truth. 5 Ladies and gentlemen, what the government told you is a false narrative. It's a hypothetical. 6 They got it 7 wrong. And they realized they got it wrong 2015, 2016, or 2017. 8 9 Now, they brought in a lot of good email readers 10 here, right? People who could read emails. Now, remember 11 the testimony, there's millions of emails. They must have read about 25 or 30 of the millions, and they want you to 12 13 say, "Oh, mad scramble. Oh, an email, this is how I read 14 it." You heard the witnesses. You heard the witnesses. 15 During those six years that they -- after they did the search -- and you heard Mr. Greenlaw denied the capital 16 17 markets. Now we have no access, bank accounts closed, 18 because of a search warrant and nothing else. 19 Six years they maintained the business, maintained 20 their employees. And you heard those employees, nice people? Yes. But that's not what we're saying. 21 They all 22 told you that these were people of great moral character, 23 high integrity. 24 Ladies and gentlemen, the government has got this 25 They woefully, woefully failed to meet their burden wrong.

1 here, and they refuse to do the right thing. After six 2 years they bring you in, and they say, "We traced the money 3 and it wasn't there on the day before." 4 And, oh, the prosecutor told you in closing 5 argument there wasn't enough money, but you saw there was in other bank accounts. Okay. 6 7 "Why, I don't know," she said. Why -- oh, because you don't know, you don't know, and these people are guilty? 8 9 Well, the answer is in the evidence. Just-in-time 10 Financing, we don't put the money from Account A into the operating account to pay the distributions until the day 11 12 it's due. So it's like a payroll account. That's not a 13 crime. 14 You know, when the government's wrong, they're 15 supposed to admit they're wrong. Okay? They're supposed to admit they're wrong, not do this. This is wrong. 16 This is 17 These people have run a business legitimately and wrong. 18 now someone wants to Monday morning quarterback a 19 hypothetical about whether something is, in fact, an 20 affiliated transaction. And not one witness has said it 21 was. 22 Enough. Enough. Ladies and gentlemen, we urge 23 you, there isn't sufficient evidence to prove any, any of 24 these defendants' guilt, not even close. Reasonable doubt

is easy in this case. And I urge you by your verdict of not

1	guilty to let these people go back to their jobs. Let them
2	do what they've been doing their entire lives, that's living
3	honorable, decent lives. And the government knows it.
4	Nothing further, your Honor.
5	MS. GOODMAN: Yes, your Honor.
6	May it please the Court.
7	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
8	MS. GOODMAN: Counsel, ladies and gentlemen of the
9	jury, conspiracies happen in the dark. And UDF and Brandon
10	Jester operated in the light.
11	Now, first I want to thank you for your time over
12	the past week. I want to apologize, my co-counsel, Jeff
13	Ansley, can't be here due to COVID.
14	But the government has a fundamental
15	misunderstanding about what UDF how it operates and what
16	it does. That has been the case for over the past six
17	years. And unfortunately, that is why Brandon Jester is
18	here, a misunderstanding. Whether willful or not, that's
19	why he's here.
20	Brandon Jester is involved in the operational side
21	of UDF. This isn't an operational and development case.
22	It's a disclosure case. And we heard that through the
23	government's challenges of the disclosures as it pertains to
24	auditors, investors, regulators. That's the core of this
25	case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our borrowers.

But the evidence that we saw about Brandon Jester was at the asset manager level on the operations, like the people you heard from, Aaron Richards, Jeff Gilpatrick, Casey Ford, the witnesses who worked beside him as an asset manager. And Brandon was an asset manager from 2008 to 2012 and then became the director of asset management. So another reason, how do we know this is a disclosure case? Ryan Burkhardt, one of the government's witnesses, when he said that other lenders that work with Centurion do the exact same thing that UDF does with regards to the same land release payments, he was asked one question on redirect by the government: "Mr. Burkhardt, do you play a role in UDF's SEC filings?" When it comes to the operational side of things where Mr. Jester is, the government essentially ignores the fundamental center of the transactions that we do with our borrowers, the economic substance of what our loans do with

There are facts in this case that the government is asking you to assume in order to find Brandon Jester guilty of a crime.

Assume that there's no collateral between this fund and this fund, a transaction, assume there's no collateral in the middle. Assume that loans are created solely for the purpose of making distributions.

1 Assume that UDF V made loans with UDF III. Assume 2 that modeling projections have to be based on an executed 3 contract. And assume that other lenders do not do what we're doing. The government never asked any other lenders 4 5 if they operated this way. We did. You heard First Continental and Trez operated this 6 7 Ryan Burkhardt told you that. We asked that, you heard that. That was the first time the government had 8 9 heard it, too. 10 And in opening last week, we told you about Ford We said that there's -- we said that it's basically 11 Motors. the business decision, the forecast to model, to think about 12 13 what you're doing in the future. That you're budgeting for 14 future projects. That you're making a plan. And we learned 15 that UDF operated the same way, business forecasts and business models. 16 17 Because if you don't make projections, you're not 18 going to have work to do next year. And lenders and land 19 developers, they can't stay in business without having 20 future projects. Of course not. It makes business sense, they are running a business. 21 22 I want to talk to you about Buffington, Blake 23 Buffington, specifically. On direct examination he told you 24 that Buffington couldn't pay its loans. Said in September,

I'm out. Can't do it. We have to stop everything.

1	Well, on cross-examination with Mr. Ansley, he
2	said that in 2020 he recalled having a conversation with
3	Jeff Gilpatrick where he did indicate he was going to repay
4	those loans. And we saw the letter. I think it was
5	September 24, 2014, where on direct examination he said,
6	"That letter, I said we couldn't pay." Well, when you
7	really dug into that letter, it's on overhead costs.
8	And he actually said on cross-examination, there's
9	nothing in this letter that talks about we can't repay.
10	That letter, if you really look at it, it talks about
11	projections and repaying in 2015.
12	He also said in cross-examination that he wanted
13	an orderly transition, an orderly wind-down of the business.
14	That is exactly opposite of "We can't pay. We're out.
15	We've got to cease operations."
16	And a wind-down, an orderly wind-down takes years.
17	And it did in this case. 2016 is when the business
18	concluded with Buffington.
19	Also, we heard about advance requests with
20	Mr. Buffington. Remember, September of '14, he said, I'm
21	out, but we saw advance requests in August, September,
22	October, and November of 2014 where Buffington swears that
23	it certifies that the financial status of the loan has not
24	changed since origination.
25	Again and again and again, they certify. And that

1 There's no, "We're out. is what's in writing. We can't 2 pay" in writing. He told you that letter that they sent, 3 that didn't cover it. 4 We also heard from another Buffington 5 representative. We heard from James Dorney. He claims that Buffington was not getting paid overhead. Well, we learned 6 7 that wasn't true. We heard from another government witness, 8 9 Stephanie Andreatta. She told you that in September -- or 10 August of 2013 to September of 2014, UDF paid over 11 \$1.2 million in overhead draws. Sounds to me like UDF was 12 still paying. 13 And let's talk about the spreadsheet, the 14 Buffington spreadsheet, where we looked at 11 future 15 projects. The business decision that UDF made to put future projects in a spreadsheet. And when you get back in the 16 17 jury room and you're looking at the indictment, you're going 18 to see those future projects are nowhere in that indictment. 19 There's 11 projects we talked about. 20 government brought you two witnesses. We heard from Mr. Bascha on the Friesenhahn property. He told you, "I 21 22 wasn't really involved in the property. It could have been 23 It could have been 2014. It was in our 2014 24 spreadsheet, that is not inappropriate." 25 You heard from Harry Adams who said in February of

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 '14, UDF submitted an LOI. In May of '14, that company
2 reurged to collect LOIs. Jeff Gilpatrick resubmitted. He
3 said, "We stand on the LOI that we submitted."

Mr. Adams said the property went under contract in June. Well, Aaron Richards testified that, "If we're good at our jobs, we're still paying attention to the properties that are under contract because how the market is, things fall apart. Sometimes things don't make it through the feasibility period and you want to go in and scoop the project up. We submitted two LOIs. Clearly there were conversations and there was interest. We put it in our spreadsheet." Nothing wrong with that.

We also heard from a number of witnesses who said it doesn't need to be an executed contract, it doesn't need to be in an LOI, and it can go in our spreadsheet because it is a forecast.

You also heard from Susan Powell. She said she conducted a trend analysis and it was compatible with the future projects. She also said that Whitley Penn asked for UDF's cash flow analysis. And that's what they got. They got the spreadsheet that UDF created, not our borrowers, UDF.

We brought you Jeff Gilpatrick, the individual who actually worked up that spreadsheet. And if you remember, he had 11 binders surrounding him of all the due diligence

1 that he had on the projects that were in that spreadsheet. 2 He told you why he added them and he had reasons for doing 3 so. 4 Then you heard from Brandon Jester himself who 5 told you modeling portfolios with future projects is appropriate, it's common, and I trust my asset manager, Jeff 6 Gilpatrick. I knew he had projects coming down. I knew he 7 had due diligence. 8 9 That's what we did with our spreadsheet and 10 Buffington knew about it. And how do we know that? We 11 heard from numerous asset managers that were in constant contact with our borrowers. We've got weekly meetings. 12 13 We've got phone calls; they know about it. And on top of 14 that, Jeff Gilpatrick told you he sent his changes to Matt 15 Parker in an email, and said, "Here are my updates." Now, I want to talk to you about Government's 16 17 Exhibit 96. Ms. Eggers mentioned it earlier this morning. 18 That's the Whitley Penn loan impairment review in March of 19 2014. 20 As if that document somehow impacts what our future projects have to be based on and that is just wrong 21 22 for a few different reasons. Number one, the loan 23 impairment review document, the final document is dated 24 March 4th -- I'm sorry. March 6th. We don't even receive

Matt Parker's spreadsheet until after that. It has nothing

1 | to do with our spreadsheet.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Second, if you look at the bottom of that first page of the exhibit, you're going to see that UDF describes -- how it describes how UDF values the loan portfolio. It's based on the market. It's based on home supplies. It's based on current and historic market trends.

But the government seized on the sentence that said, "Cash flow forecast also include executed purchase contracts for lots." The government just simply misreads it, and they essentially read in, exclusively under contract. And if you really take a look at that document, you're going to see that that applies to lot sales, but the government disregards that.

And we spent a lot of time in this case on draw requests. As if the government is pretending that those draw requests exclusively had to come from our borrowers, and that's not the case.

In opening, we showed you the contract that says in our sole discretion we can do this. Our contracts say that. Our borrowers sign that. And then you heard Aaron Richards say, "Sometimes we have these conversations in meetings and then I'll follow up afterwards and send it to the staff, get in touch with the accounting staff. Our contracts allow us to do this."

We also heard a lot about the Frisco 113 loan.

And that was the loan where Aaron Rogers -- the draw 1 2 request -- Richards sent to Centurion's accounting crew. 3 This is a land loan pay-down. A new loan. 4 A fact that the government either does not or just 5 will not see, we brought you Aaron Richards the author of the email that we repeatedly saw in this case. And he told 6 7 you we do this because it's our job to push these projects forward. You cannot move the projects forward unless you 8 9 release the land. 10 And on those emails, you heard from Linda Visser 11 who told you -- "What does UDF do?" 12 "We provide more documentation than the other lenders who do the same thing as us. We have additional 13 14 paperwork to make sure that we do this process the right way." 15 And then we've talked a lot about the project 16 17 level and the portfolio level draws. To this day, the 18 government, I think, just still does not under this because 19 you heard the government ask witness after witness, "Why are 20 we seeing over a million dollar draw request coming from UDF to the borrowers instead of Centurion sending it to us?" 21 As if these are invoices for plumbing or sewage. 22 23 Of course, they're coming from us. They're refinancing and 24 land releases. We are moving projects forward. This is 25 what we do, and we're allowed to do it.

Brandon Jester operates on the operational side of 1 2 He is not involved in disclosures. this business? 3 not involved in SEC filings. He is not involved with 4 auditors or investors. 5 And I want to talk about the jury instruction that applies to these facts. I want to talk about good faith? 6 7 The judge just instructed you, and you'll have the instruction, but you'll see it says, "If you have a 8 9 reasonable doubt as to whether or not Mr. Jester had a good 10 faith belief that what he was doing was legal, you must 11 acquit him and say so by your verdict of not guilty." So what evidence do we have of Mr. Jester's intent 12 13 or his good faith? Well, we know in December of 2020, he 14 voluntarily went in to meet with the government. 15 that he spoke to Tim McCormick who was doing an internal investigation. He said he spoke to everyone and he got all 16 17 the records that he needed. 18 Mr. Jester operated openly, transparently, and in 19 the light, not in the dark. 20 You also heard UDF employees say Mr. Jester has never asked me to do anything that I thought was improper. 21 22 But instead, the government showed you two emails 23 from Mr. Jester. We saw it countless times, so let's just 24 talk about them. "We need to show it paying off." That's

what the email says. It's a loan renewal exercise, there's

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	nothing	wrong	with	that.

Second email, "Put everything that is a 3 possibility in there." This is modeling future projects.

4 And I still don't see what the problem is with that. It's a 5 business decision and we had due diligence.

And you heard from Harry Adams, "We don't know what we're doing in the next few years, but I know based on my skill and my experience that I'm going to get some projects done."

So those two emails, those are the cover-up emails in this case? That's it.

I submit to you those are operational asset manager emails between two employees doing their jobs. that is not sufficient to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Brandon Jester had any intent to commit a crime.

Brandon Jester got on that stand, and he told you what he meant in those emails. And Jeff Gilpatrick got on the stand and told you what he understood from those emails.

You know, that spreadsheet did not rise and fall on the issue of flexibility when it comes to a single future project. Mr. Parker sent us a spreadsheet that included future projects.

You know, and keep in mind, Jeff Gilpatrick, he worked at Buffington and then he worked at UDF, he's still at UDF. He knew about those Buffington spreadsheets from

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 his time there, and it continued to his time at UDF.
2 There is not sufficient evidence in this case to

have any belief that Brandon Jester had any intent to commit a crime. And by "intent," I mean that the government failed

5 to show any intent for any of the counts. Because when

there's no showing of an intent to defraud, you must find

7 | that there's no intent across the board, across all counts.

And you heard the evidence of Mr. Jester's good faith starting with the government's witnesses. You heard he assisted in good faith modeling of the Buffington loan with other asset managers and with the knowledge of the Buffington personnel, who, again, had future projects in their spreadsheet, too.

You heard that he participated in draw requests for new loans and paid down earlier loans to move projects forward, which benefits our borrowers.

Brandon Jester is here because the government disagrees with the internal business decisions being made at UDF. This is an attempt at criminalization of business and commerce.

You know, and Judge O'Connor instructed you on character, and I want to reiterate something that my colleague said on character: "Because evidence of a defendant's character may give rise to reasonable doubt."

And the first time we heard about Brandon Jester's

1 character was through the government's case. We heard from 2 Stephanie Andreatta who said that she's worked with 3 Mr. Jester, she believes him to be honest. 4 On redirect examination, the government got up and 5 put one of those email in front of her and said, "Would an honest man do this?" Her response was, "I still think he's 6 7 a honest man." We also heard from Jeff Kesler, another government 8 9 witness, who said, "Mr. Jester acts in a way that you'd 10 expect in this industry. He's honest." Aaron Richards, again, we saw that email over and 11 12 over and over. And we brought him to you. And he's worked 13 with Mr. Jester and he told you he's honest. And he also 14 explained the Frisco 113 email. 15 You know, and there was some insinuation about money being paid to Mr. Jester that was dirty for the work 16 17 that he did over a five-year period at UDF. And by my math, 18 that was about \$145,000 a year. That's not inappropriate. 19 It's not motive. There's nothing dirty about it. He does a 20 job. 21 And I think it's important for you to remember 22 that the government ran the search in 2016. You heard about 23 the massive amounts of emails. You heard that Tim McCormick 24 came in and did an investigation on behalf of the

independent trustees. And you heard that after he reported

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) 4:21-cr-289-O Vol 8 January 20, 2022

Page 1535

1	his conclusion, every single one of these defendants is
2	still employed.
3	You heard from former UDF employees, you heard
4	from current UDF employees, and you heard from Mr. Jester
5	himself.
6	I don't think the government has come close to
7	proving beyond a reasonable doubt when it pertains to
8	Mr. Jester.
9	And at the end of this case, I am asking you to
10	return a verdict of not guilty to all counts on behalf of
11	Mr. Jester. And I believe that is the only appropriate
12	verdict in this case.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. STEPHENS: Would you like to take our morning
15	recess?
16	THE COURT: No.
17	MR. STEPHENS: Very well. Your Honor, may it
18	please the Court.
19	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
20	MR. STEPHENS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
21	It's good to see you again. I hope everyone is having a
22	good morning so far.
23	As you know, my name is Neal Stephens, and I
24	represent Ms. Obert.
25	What I want to do is take you back a little bit to

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

where my opening statement was. What I'm going to lay out
for you are a few things. I'm going to describe the law at
the start. And my colleagues have already touched on it a
little bit. I'm going to go into a little bit more depth.

And then what I'm going to do is I'm going to go back to where I was on my opening statement where I talk about the rules of the road for UDF V, UDF III, and UDF IV, so you basically have a toolbox by which you can marshal the evidence against the charges in the case.

And then what I want to do is what I want to talk about the government's investigation and confirmation bias in the way that they conducted their investigation. And I'm going to be talking to you about Mr. Martinez and the way that he analyzed the evidence.

And then what I want to do is I want to contrast that against a legitimate investigation, one in which you consider all aspect of the transaction and all of the underlying documents so you can get an accurate snapshot of what happened in those transactions to fully analyze what the intent of these individuals was.

And what you're going to see is that they operated in good faith. And what the jury instructions are going to tell you is if they operated in good faith, there is no case here.

Then what I would like to do is walk through what

20

21

22

23

24

25

burden.

1 I have as smoke and mirrors. And we'll get there when we 2 get there. 3 Finally, what I would like to do is wrap up by 4 summarizing the evidence related to my client, Ms. Obert. 5 Okay? So let's start. And let me start with the law. 6 7 There's a presumption of innocence. You've heard this both as you were getting impaneled and you heard it again this 8 9 morning. And it's important. 10 All of the defendants, it's a clean slate. They are all presumed by the law to be innocent. They sit before 11 12 you innocent until you marshal the evidence against them. 13 That's what we're going to do here this morning. 14 The burden of proof. Mr. Lewis will speak in 15 detail about this. But for our purposes right now, the government has the burden. They have the burden throughout. 16 17 We have no burden. But what I'm going to try and do this 18 morning is demonstrate the evidence that we brought forward

It's the United States of America, that's the Constitution.

Good faith. I've already mentioned it. This is an important instruction. It's going to appear at page 13 of the jury instructions. You'll have a copy of the jury instructions when you're back there. Please read this

If they fail to, you must acquit. That's the law.

and how that demonstrates that they cannot meet their

instruction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It will tell you, "In determining whether or not the defendant acted with criminal intent, you may consider whether or not the defendant had a good-faith belief that what he or she was doing was legal."

If you have reasonable doubt as to whether the defendant had a good faith belief, you must acquit. You must find the defendant not guilty. That's good faith. I will demonstrate to you here today that the evidence shows that all of these individuals acted in good faith.

Good character. In her closing remarks, my colleague from the government talked about, well, you know, they're good people. It doesn't mean this. It doesn't mean that.

There's going to be an instruction in the instructions, it should appear, I think, at about page 5.

And what it says is, "Where a defendant has offered evidence of good general reputation from opinion testimony concerning truth, veracity, honesty, integrity, character, you should consider such evidence." That is on the table here today.

We heard it throughout the trial as to all four of the individuals from all of the government's witness.

"Evidence of a defendant's character may give right to a reasonable doubt since you may think it improbable that a person of good character with respect to

1 those traits would commit such a crime." 2 That is on the table for you to consider. Willfully. Now, what I want to do is walk you 3 4 through some of the intent-driven instructions so you understand what the state of mind has to be for the 5 government to prove their case. 6 7 Willfully. What that means is, the individual executives must have a specific intent to do something the 8 9 law forbids; that is, they have to act with bad purpose 10 either to disobey or to disregard the law intentionally. 11 Willfully requires proof the defendants acted with knowledge that his or her conduct violated the law. And 12 just think about that against the emails and the other 13 14 evidence that you've seen in this case. There's no evidence 15 of that. They can't get to this standard. Specific intent to defraud. The government is 16 17 obligated to prove beyond a reasonable doubt a conscious, 18 knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone. We're going to talk more about this. You heard the evidence from the 19 20 witnesses on the stand. Can anyone identify a single 21 witness who said that Ms. Obert had a conscious knowing 22 intent to cheat or deceive anyone? Mr. Greenlaw? No. 23 Mr. Wissink? No. Mr. Jester? No. 24 Falsity. A representation -- this is a page 12, 25 19 through 20. A representation is false if it's known to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 be untrue provided it's made with the intent to defraud.

The thing about falsity, when you consider what's at issue here, there is no law, they're charged with securities fraud and wire fraud. There is not a law in the United States that says a company cannot do related-party transactions. There is not a single law in the country that says a company cannot do affiliate transactions.

You heard from Mr. Kitchens, he that companies all across America do those on a daily basis. We're going to get to the rules of road, but please understand, there is not a single law that says a company cannot do an affiliate transaction. There is not a single law that says a company cannot do a related-party transaction.

All right. I'm also going to point you to some testimony, which we'll get to, from two of the auditors in this case, government witnesses, who said, "Reasonable auditors acting in good faith considering the same transaction could arrive at a different conclusion as to whether something constituted a related-party transaction or an affiliate transaction."

Both operating in good faith could reach a different conclusion. You cannot get to beyond a reasonable doubt given that that's the testimony from two government witnesses who analyzed this type of evidence.

Conspiracy to commit wire fraud. These are the

actual charges now. So to commit wire fraud, the	ere has to
be an agreement to commit a crime, the crime of	wire fraud
where the defendant would know the unlawful purpo	ose and act
willfully with the intent to further the unlawful	l purpose.
There's that term "willfully" again.	
Wire fraud affecting a financial instit	tution.
"Did the defendant knowingly devised or intend to	o devise a
scheme to defraud the investing public, sharehold	ders of
UDF III, IV, and V."	
What's completely lacking in this case	is any
evidence that any of these individuals were trying	ng to harm
their investors. And I will prove that to you as	s we walk
through the evidence that we have before you.	
The defendant had to act with specific	intent to
defraud and that scheme to defraud affected a fin	nancial
institution, which Mr. Pelletier has already sum	marized for
you.	
Conspiracy to commit securities fraud.	"That the
defendant, and at least one other person, agree	to commit a
crime of securities fraud."	
There has to be an agreement to break	the law.
That they knew the unlawful purpose. And again,	that they
had to reach that high standard of willful.	
Securities fraud. These are the substa	antive
accounts. This is Counts III through X. "The de	efendants

1 knowingly attempted to execute a scheme or artifice to 2 defraud with the intent to defraud." 3 Again, we're back to intent. And that -- when you're considering intent, you have to consider good faith, 4 5 which is where we started. Securities fraud. "Defense knowingly executed a 6 7 scheme or artifice to obtain money or property by means of 8 false or fraudulent pretenses." Again, intent to defraud. 9 All right. And affiliate, we talked a little bit 10 about this, and we'll get to it on the rules of the road 11 because we will talk about UDF III and UDF IV and UDF V being affiliates. We acknowledge that. 12 13 What's different is when the government is trying 14 to extend the term, affiliated or related party, to someone 15 outside of that. Centurion, for example. That is not the evidence in this case. So when you talk about control, it's 16 17 the power to direct or cause the direction of the management 18 policies of a person. 19 UDF was not directing the management. They were 20 not running Centurion. That is not the evidence. And I'll show you some testimony from Mr. Kitchens on that very 21 22 point. 23 So that's the law. Now, let me get to 24 Chapter 2 which is the rules of the road. And we did this

in opening. And again, what I think is critical in this

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

case is to understand the similarities and differences
between UDF III, IV, and V, and how in these transactions
everyone is benefiting and that's okay.

UDF V, we started on this in my opening a few days ago, right? And the attorney gave you a framework to evaluate the evidence in the case. So for each action that you are considering, identify the correct fund. Are we talking about UDF III, are we talking about UDF IV, or are we talking about UDF V? And then apply the correct rules of the road for that fund.

And what I told you in opening statement was if you did that, marshaling the evidence, the answer is going to be, yes, that UDF complied with its policies. And I'm going to demonstrate that to you here this morning.

All right. This is another slide that I used in my opening statement. This comes from their disclosures. And this is what UDF V said it would not do, and we don't contest that. So here's what UDF V said it would not do, and did not do so.

It will not make loans to or participate in real estate investments or provide credit enhancements with our affiliates. UDF will not sell any loan to, acquire any loan from, participate in any loan with UDF affiliates. This is UDF V. The UDF V will not sell any asset to, acquire any asset from, participate in any asset with the UDF funds.

1 And they did not do so. 2 Okay. How do we know that? Well, let's look at some of the testimony. Dale Kitchens, who reviewed all of 3 4 these transactions and recalled he actually went through and 5 looked at all the documents, underlying the loan files to figure out how the transactions were actually structured. 6 7 His testimony is that, did UDF V do any of these things? No, they did not. Did UDF V -- that's the first 8 9 one I have. Did UDF V do any of that, selling any assets, 10 acquiring assets from, participating in any assets, did they 11 do any of those things? No, they did not. That's the 12 testimony. 13 Ms. Obert herself took the stand and subjected 14 herself to cross-examination, and the testimony from the stand from Ms. Obert is consistent with Mr. Kitchens. 15 "Ms. Obert, did UDF V ever originate loans, 16 17 participate in loans, provide credit enhancements to any 18 affiliate at UDF V?" 19 "No, they did not." 20 "Did UDF V say that they would sell any loan to, acquire any loan from, participate in any loan with any 21 22 other UDF funds? Are you familiar with that?" 23 They say no. 24 "Did UDF V ever do any of those things?" 25 "No, they did not."

1 That is the testimony in this case. UDF V did not 2 do -- wait. UDF V did what it said it -- I'm going to say 3 this wrong. Let me stop and get it right. What UDF V said 4 it did not do, UDF V never did. All right? 5 So related-party transaction, and I had touched on The two auditors from the government got on 6 this earlier. 7 the stand and acknowledged that this is an area of judgment. This is an area where reasonable people, objective people, 8 9 acting in good faith could look at the same transaction and 10 reach a different conclusion. The only conclusions we have in this case is that 11 12 they're not affiliate transactions. They are not 13 related-party transactions. But even if there was testimony 14 going both ways, you could still have all of the executives 15 acting in good faith. Why? Because it's an area of 16 judgment. They cannot get there on the evidence because of 17 this. 18 Here's Mr. Downey. What Mr. Downey says. 19 auditors might have a different view as to what qualifies as 20 an undisclosed related-party transactions that needs to be 21 disclosed?" Yes. 22 When we get back to where we were with Mr. Lawlis. 23 Mr. Lawlis was the audit partner at Whitley Penn. What that 24 means is that a reasonable accountant, both acting in good

faith, could reach a conclusion that is different regarding

whether a particular transaction is a related-party
transaction.
Yes, I believe so. Right? So it's Mr. Downey.
No government witness said we did this. No
government witness actually looked at the transactions and
said that UDF V did something that UDF V said it would not
do. That evidence does not exist before you. There can be
any guilt on any count related to UDF V based on that
evidence. Okay?
What can UDF V do? UDF V can do loans with common
borrowers. That's okay. And remember, we put up those
disclosures that talked about common borrowers. That's
UDF V. All of these funds can do transactions with common
borrowers.
Michael Bodwell, who was the audit partner on both
UDF III, UDF IV, and UDF V. I asked him the question:
"It's okay for UDF V to originate loans to a common borrower
of UDF III and UDF IV; is that fair?"
"Yes, I believe so."
So that's the auditor.
Here's the due diligence analyst, Kevin Eades.
For example, the company's first investment this is
UDF V was a \$10.7 million loan to Frisco 113 to refinance
the borrower's land acquisition. Frisco 113 is a Centurion
special project, and it's a borrower's land acquisition of

1	81 acres of residential land in Collin County.
2	Management indicates that CTMG is not affiliated
3	with the Centurion SP is an affiliate of Centurion.
4	"Question: It's not an affiliated transaction,
5	correct?"
6	"Correct."
7	So the auditors are telling you that these are not
8	affiliated transactions of UDF V. The due diligence analyst
9	is telling you they are not affiliated transactions.
10	And then from the investor side, the
11	broker/dealer, Rick Murphy, says the same thing.
12	"Did you know that UDF II, III, IV, and V had
13	common borrowers amongst them?"
14	"Yes. It was disclosed." People knew it. These
15	are not affiliated transactions. These are loans with
16	common borrowers.
17	Let's transition away from UDF V and talk about
18	UDF III and UDF IV and what UDF III and UDF IV can do. I
19	had this slide up in my opening to prepare you that we were
20	going to show evidence that UDF III loans can be refinanced
21	involving a common borrower. And that UDF IV could do that.
22	It was anticipated. It was expected. It's okay.
23	Susan Powell, the audit partner at Whitley Penn.
24	I asked her: "Ms. Obert told you that the money transfers
25	could be made from UDF IV to UDF III to pay off a higher

1	interest rate loan if it's for the benefit of a common
2	borrower; correct?"
3	"Yes. Correct."
4	"Ms. Obert told you and you understood it was
5	allowable under the loan documents between a common borrower
6	in UDF IV and UDF III to do this type of transaction,
7	correct?"
8	"Yes."
9	The outside auditors knew the business practice.
10	They knew how these transactions were structured.
11	Tom Carroci, government expert, came in and
12	admitted the same thing. Government expert.
13	"This UDF IV disclosure that's there will be a
14	refinancing of loans and investments by and between the
15	United Development Funding programs?"
16	"Yes."
17	It was disclosed and everyone knew it, and even
18	the government's experts who looked at it after the fact
19	came in and agreed with our position.
20	Confirmation bias. All right. We talked about
21	Mr. Martinez.
22	"It's fair to say that you did not analyze whether
23	the UDF V investors received any benefit from those other
24	UDF V loans in conducting your analysis?"
25	"That's correct."

1	"It's fair to say that your cash-tracing
2	methodology was the same on the UDF IV transactions that
3	involved a common borrower with UDF III as the UDF V
4	transaction that involved a common borrower?"
5	"I believe that's so, yes."
6	My point with Mr. Martinez, they picked a
7	conclusion and then designed their work to drive that
8	conclusion. And that is an inappropriate way to run an
9	investigation. That's just confirming your bias, but it's
10	not providing the men and women of the jury with the
11	analytical evidence that you need to martial the evidence to
12	reach an accurate result.
13	Same thing, "I did not consider economic benefits.
14	I did not consider economic benefits. I only considered the
15	movement of money."
16	Now, what does he do with the bank accounts?
17	Mr. Pelletier talked about the payroll bank account. This
18	is relevant. What they were saying was that there's
19	insufficient money in an account.
20	"Well, did you look at all the cash available in
21	all the accounts?"
22	"No. I just looked at this account."
23	"Well, had you looked at all the accounts, would
24	the result have been different?"
25	Yes, it would have been different, because in this

example that we used with him, they were \$11 million over 1 2 what he said the shortfall was. It's confirmation bias. 3 Here's another mistake that he made. Remember, 4 the scheme is that all the money is flowing to the UDF III 5 investors, and it's the UDF IV and V investors who were at 6 risk. But if he actually looked underneath his 7 documents, what would he have seen? He would have seen 8 9 money moving back in other transactions to the UDF IV and 10 the UDF V investors. That is not a scheme to defraud. 11 That's the business as it's operating. Third mistake, and this is of many, and I'm just 12 13 trying to summarize it in the time I have with you. There are 18 transactions in Mr. Martinez's 14 15 53 transactions that have documentation in them demonstrating that clear -- and evidence of anyone who's 16 17 going to read them that there is going to be money paid off 18 those transaction to distributions to UDF III investors. 19 It's open and transparent. It's right there for 20 the auditors. If you're running a scheme to defraud, you 21 don't run to your auditors with the evidence of fraud. 22 They're going to the auditors with the evidence of this is 23 how we run our business. And I've already shown you from 24 the testimony, the auditors understood their business and

didn't have an issue with it.

So I asked Mr. Kitchen: "What does that chart
mean?"
It represents that the 80 transactions over the
60-month period were selected for testing. It shows that
the transparency of the company in giving access to these
that were supposedly problematic transactions to the
auditors. Open and transparent.
Mr. Ferguson said the same thing.
"The fact that these documents exist in the
journal entries demonstrates what to you about
transparency?"
"The company was transparent in their accounting
practices."
Mr. Martinez. Let's talk about his cash-tracing
model.
"Mr. Martinez, has that cash-tracing model ever
been qualified by any federal court to provide expert
testimony on your theory?"
"No. Never."
What do the other experts say?
"Mr. Kitchen, in your 40 years of experience as a
financial fraud investigator focused on real estate
transactions, have you ever seen a fraud investigation based
exclusively only on a cash-tracing theory?"
Answer: "I have never seen a fraud investigation

1 based just on that." Forty years. 2 "Mr. Ferguson, in your 20 years of conducting fraud 3 investigations, have you ever seen a financial fraud 4 investigation based strictly and exclusively on simply cash 5 tracing?" "No." 6 It's confirmation bias. That's not enough. 7 Legitimate investigation. What Mr. Ferguson, and 8 9 particularly Mr. Kitchens did, is they went and read all the 10 documents. Right? They looked underneath these 11 transactions. And I would direct you to Shahan Prairie. Let me 12 13 give you the exhibit numbers. And I know you don't have notebooks, so bear with me. Defendants' Exhibits 3905 to 14 3924. It's the start of the 3900 series. Most of our 15 exhibits are in the 3000 to 4000 series. Please review 16 17 those. 18 These are the documents that you are going to see, 19 and they're going to show -- this is on the UDF IV example. 20 What you're going to see is what we covered before. And I'm not going to go through this at length; Mr. Kitchens did. 21 22 There are benefits flowing to UDF III and 23 IV investors, and then there's the subsequent loan. When 24 the project's in the next phase, the bulk of that loan is going to come to the common borrower. And he's going to 25

1	build to get to where they've got finished lots to sell.
2	But a portion of that loan proceeds has to go pay
3	off the original UDF III loans. It's business. Banks do it
4	all the time.
5	Same thing with the UDF IV and III loans. There
6	are benefits flowing in all directions. Everyone is
7	benefiting here. That's good business. Good faith.
8	Here's Mr. Martinez's analysis by contrast. He's
9	just looking in one direction to confirm the bias that he
10	arrived at his investigation with. That's not objective,
11	and it doesn't provide you the information you need to reach
12	an accurate result in this case.
13	Smoke and mirrors. I'll go through this quickly.
14	The cash tracing, we've already covered.
15	Hypotheticals, Mr. Pelletier covered.
16	Solely to pay distributions, completely ignores
17	the common borrower. And we demonstrated that to you on the
18	two charts I just had up, right?
19	UDF controls Centurion. No, they do not.
20	Mr. Kitchens is clear as a bell, and this is the evidence in
21	the case. That also goes to the definition of control.
22	This is the prosecutor asking the questions.
23	With respect the answer: "With respect to the
24	loan but not with respect to the entity and the man,
25	Mr. Moayedi, there's no way that you can describe it as

1 control of the borrower or an affiliated transaction just 2 because there's that provision in the lending contract." He's talking about the discretionary advance 3 4 language in that contract. And the testimony from that 5 stand from an expert with 40 years in the field doing affiliated transactions and reviewing related-party 6 7 transactions, there is no way that that provision in that contract constitutes control such that it would be an 8 9 affiliated transaction. No wav. 10 Cash from operations. And the relevant point here, cash from operations is measured over a period of time 11 12 and you don't have a conclusion until the end of that 13 So if the end of that period is measured to period. 14 December 31, you don't know what the cash from operation is 15 until you get right to December 31. What the government is suggesting is that on 16 17 December 22, they're going to take a snapshot in time and 18 say you had \$7 in your checking account, therefore, you do 19 not have cash from operations to cut that \$100 check. 20 is not the way it works in accounting. 21 How do we know that? 22 Mr. Kitchen again, "In your 40 years of conducting

point in time in the middle of the time period under review,

fraud investigations, have you ever seen a regulator suggest

that cash from operations should be measured at a specific

23

24

1	just like the example I gave you?"
2	"No, I have never encountered that. Not a single
3	time. That is not the way you interpret cash from."
4	All right. I'll wrap up here quickly with a
5	little bit of review of the evidence about Ms. Obert.
6	What did we hear? Audit partner, Michael Bodwell,
7	worked with her for 13 years. Smart, responsive,
8	professional, honest, respectful.
9	And not just Ms. Obert, her entire team. It's the
10	way they run their business, all of them.
11	Jeff Lawlis. Smart, responsive, polite,
12	respectful. "If I asked her questions, she gave us
13	responses. If she didn't have the information, she sent it
14	to someone on her team, members of her team brought us back
15	the information we needed."
16	Susan Powell. Audit partner, UDF III. These are
17	three audit partners that covered the three funds. Smart,
18	responsive, friendly, respectful, polite.
19	Stephanie Braislin, also Whitley Penn, responsive,
20	her team, responsive.
21	Cheryl Cox, who works for Ms. Obert and has for
22	years and years, supportive, mentored her, helped her go to
23	school at night so she could get her agree and become a CPA.
24	Adrianna Tidwell also worked for her. Good
25	mentor, absolutely. Loved working for her. That's

1	Ms. Obert.
2	What did the government put on the stand? How
3	many witnesses took the stand and said anything negative
4	about Ms. Obert? Think about it right now. Think about it.
5	How many? Zero. Not a single witness.
6	It's for those reasons, ladies and gentlemen, that
7	we are asking that you return a verdict of not guilty on all
8	counts as to all defendants.
9	Thank you very much for your time.
10	THE COURT: Thank you.
11	Mr. Lewis.
12	MR. LEWIS: May it please the Court.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
14	MR. LEWIS: The last, but hopefully not least.
15	Thank you very much for your time. I've watched
16	you and you've been on time, you've been listening very
17	carefully, and we appreciate it. We truly do. It's a very,
18	very important day for all four all four of these people.
19	This matters to them a lot. And we appreciate you guys
20	studying the case and arriving at a fair and just verdict.
21	I am going to talk to you a little bit about what
22	the law is and the Constitution. It's a great thing, the
23	Constitution. It applies and protects all of us. And I'm
24	going to spend some time talking to you about that.
25	But I do want to sort of start where I left off in

my opening, because, Jurors, I do think that the evidence 1 2 has shown that UDF was honest, they were open, they were 3 transparent, and they told the truth. 4 They got it right. They got their disclosures 5 right. They got their accounting right. And I would suggest to you, Jurors, that there has 6 been no credible evidence, no credible evidence that any of 7 these four people acted with the specific intent to violate 8 9 Specific intent. the law. 10 Think about what evidence would I want to see to demonstrate that a person was acting with the specific 11 intent to cheat, lie, and steal, to violate the law as it 12 13 relates to securities, wire fraud, and the subsequent 14 counts. 15 I would suggest to you that there is no evidence. And I do want to talk to you about what the presumptions are 16 17 and what the law is. Very, very important. 18 I love actually hearing the judge speak about it 19 both during the voir dire process, when you were being 20 selected, and when he was reading the instruction that 21 you'll have a copy of. 22 And it's interesting because when he read the --23 when he described the law to you when you first came in, 24 it's almost -- and I'm going to show you -- it's almost word

for word as to what he read to you just a few moment ago,

1 which tells you how important it is to the Court, who is the 2 judge of the law, and how important it is and I hope will be 3 to the Jury, who's the judge of the facts. 4 As the Judge indicated, as they sit here, they're 5 presumed innocent. Again, that protects all of us. are presumed by the law to be innocent. 6 They start with a clean slate until, and only if -- that changes only if the 7 government proves -- meets its burden, proves beyond a 8 9 reasonable doubt. 10 Judge O'Connor told you the exact same thing -again, without having the instructions before him, but told 11 12 you the exact same thing when you were being selected, "They 13 begin this trial with a clean slate, they are presumed 14 innocent." 15 Burden of proof. Boy, is this important. It's 16 what our country was founded on. Again, it applies and 17 protects all of us. 18 The government has the burden of proving each 19 defendant as to each count quilty beyond a reasonable doubt. 20 And if it fails to, if you have, Jurors, a reasonable 21 doubt -- and I'll talk some more about this -- then the law 22 that applies to all of us says you must acquit.

He said the same thing, Judge O'Connor said the

23

24

1 say that a person is likely guilty. Maybe there's something 2 going on, but I can't quite put my finger on it. It's not 3 enough for you to say that a person is likely guilt, probably guilty, the proof must be made beyond a reasonable 4 5 doubt. The judge also said when you were being selected 6 7 and sworn in, the burden is on the government to prove the defendant guilty and they must do so beyond a reasonable 8 9 The burden is solely on the government. 10 Jurors, as the Judge has said, the defense doesn't have to do anything. We could have actually -- consistent 11 12 with our Constitution, with our laws, we could have sat there and done nothing, asked no questions, called no 13 14 witnesses, no cross-examination, nothing. And that's what 15 our constitution allows. Of course, we didn't. We didn't. We put on 16 substantial evidence. The cross-examination, I would 17 18 suggest to you -- we'll go through it in a minute. 19 cross-examination was so enlighting. 20 But to hear one side of the story without the cross-examination, oh, my goodness, how misleading. And 21 22 I'll show you that in just a moment. How misleading. 23 Reasonable doubt. So let's talk about what is reasonable doubt. This is the heart -- this is the heart of 24

the instructions in the case regarding your deliberations

1 and your consideration.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense after careful consideration of all the evidence in the case. And this, I would suggest, Jurors, is very, very important.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely upon it and act upon it without hesitation, without hesitation in making the most important decision of your own affairs. Wow. So the most important decisions of your own affairs.

First home purchase. Did you think twice, three times, four times about that? Marriage, starting a family. That's decisions that fall into that category and the way you have to approach and treat this case. I urge you to look at that and think about that, Jurors.

Burden of proof. The Judge has told you that it's a strict burden. It's not impossible, but it's a strict burden. The instructions say it's a heavy burden, as well it should be. And I think they would agree that the government, to do what they're doing, it requires a strict or heavy burden.

What that means, Jurors, that if there is one reasonable scenario as you talk among yourselves and there's one reasonable scenario that you could think of where UDF's

transactions are real, the business was real, they were 1 2 operating in good faith, that is not guilty. 3 If you're back there, Jurors, as you're 4 deliberating and you're thinking to yourself, well, maybe, 5 it's possible, that is not quilty based on our law. It is the highest burden of proof in the law. 6 Ιt 7 is not a civil case. It is the highest burden of proof we Is it possible that reasonable people would differ, 8 9 it is not quilty. 10 Let's talk about reasonable doubt. Reasonable And the Judge has given you instructions on 11 doubt. 12 witnesses and how to weigh and evaluate their testimony. 13 Do you remember Casey Ford? He came in and 14 testified. He was the accountant from Centurion for three 15 years. And this is really one of the reasons I love 16 practicing law. During cross-examination, you listen to --17 18 he was a government witness. You listen to him and you 19 heard one side of the story and you think, Okay. I've got 20 his testimony. I'm going to evaluate him. I've looked at 21 I make a judgment like we do every day whether him. 22 somebody is telling the truth or not. 23 And then on cross-examination, we ask him, because 24 I knew that Tyson Walter, the ex-football player was coming 25 next, and I also know that the Judge imposes a rule which

1	says that witnesses can't talk to each other.
2	So on cross, "Mr. Ford, did you help Mr. Walter
3	with a \$25,000 loan from Centurion?" And all of a sudden
4	you could see the change in the way he was looking and the
5	change in the way he was reacting to that.
6	He reacted, Jurors. He knew exactly where I was
7	going. He thought for a minute, and he says, "I don't
8	recall doing that."
9	Do you remember?
10	And then I said, "Are you saying it didn't happen
11	or you just don't remember?" And I didn't get a straight
12	answer, Jurors. But the clearly, the import of his
13	testimony was I didn't get a \$25,000 loan from Centurion.
14	Next witness. Again, if you just listen to the
15	direct, with no cross-examination, it's all one-sided.
16	Cross-examination is a wonderful thing. It really is sort
17	of the crucible of truth. And it's hard to do.
18	You saw part of the cross-examination where
19	Ms. Eggers went at Mr. Jester. It was "Yes or no? Just yes
20	or no."
21	When Mr. Walter came in, we start going into this
22	about whether his lawyer had told him to tell the Judge he
23	can't show up because of the memory loss.
24	Do you remember that?
25	And it took some time, but he finally admitted to

1 That, yeah, he had said that he had had memory loss. it. But then we ended it, and said, "What about this loan from 2 3 the prior witness? You saw him when he walked out?" 4 "Yes." 5 "Did he help you get a loan?" He, without hesitating, "Yes." 6 \$25,000. 7 Truth? Believable? Reliable? Would you make a decision in the most important of 8 9 your own affairs, the most important, based on that 10 testimony? Reasonable doubt. With all due respect to 11 12 Ms. Lawson, who flew in from San Francisco, you will 13 remember she was the auditor who seemed to answer questions 14 in a very long way, the answers seemed to just sort of go on 15 and on and on and on. "Do you actually have any documents of that 16 transaction" -- and these -- I'm not casting blame. 17 18 But I am saying that you have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt. And the witness comes in here 19 20 who's actually supposed to say, "Hey, I reviewed. I flew all the way into Grapevine, met with the good people of UDF, 21 22 and interviewed them and talked to them, and then I got to 23 make decisions about their business." 24 "Did you actually have the documents of the 25 transaction?"

1	Answer: "No."
2	"Did you review the documents of the transaction?"
3	"No."
4	Almost exactly the same testimony as Martinez.
5	Would you rely on her, Jurors, in the making
6	decisions for you or your family in the most important of
7	your own affairs?
8	And then at the end. "Well, actually, I'm telling
9	them that Snyder Kearney" which is what she said she
10	relied on completely, which certainly could be. Could be.
11	And that's what it can't be. It can't be, could be, maybe,
12	could be, possibly, that's reasonable doubt.
13	We talked to her father, and again, I wasn't
14	asking, "Answer the questions, ma'am. Answer them. Yes?
15	No?" I was actually trying to be I was trying to be
16	polite.
17	And I say if an investor receives the benefit that
18	the investor is seeking through the investment that the
19	investor made, in your mind, is that a good thing?
20	Let me repeat that real quickly. The question:
21	If an investor receives the benefit that the investor is
22	seeking through the investment that the investor made, is
23	that a good thing?
24	I don't think that's a trick question. It's not
25	like, "When did you stop" and we will talk about trick

1 Because we heard some trick questions in a minute. 2 questions. And some hypotheticals. I will address that in 3 a minute. 4 But I don't think that's a trick question. What's 5 her answer? "That's such a hard question. It could go either way. It's just so complex." And of course, she 6 7 didn't do anything to look at the document. She went down there knowing that she wasn't going to understand anything. 8 9 "I don't know. I think that -- that that was up to us to 10 truly understand and we couldn't." Would you rely on her in the most important of 11 12 your own affairs? Jurors, that is textbook reasonable 13 doubt. Reasonable doubt. 14 Jeff Lawlis. I asked him about related-party 15 transactions. Mr. Stephens put this up on the screen, but it's worth another look. When asking him about 16 17 related-party transactions -- and he's the auditor from 18 Whitley Penn. 19 Reasonable accountants, reasonable accountants, 20 both acting in good faith, could reach a conclusion that is 21 different regarding whether a particular transaction is a 22 related-party transaction; is that a fair statement? I 23 believe that was Mr. Stephens' question on cross-examination. Again, a fair question, I think. 24 25 And he said, "I believe so."

1 Is that proof beyond -- when you've got two 2 people, it's fair to give you two opinions in an 3 accounting -- in an accounting or a business decision. the government's own witness, the auditor from Whitley Penn 4 5 says "Could have been A, could have been B." And they want you to convict on that testimony. 6 7 Reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt, Jurors. When your expert who 8 9 comes in from FINRA, and he's supposed to, again, give us 10 some information on affiliated-party transactions and these -- all of these documents and everything that you've 11 12 got before you -- I'm not an accountant, not a CPA, no 13 education consistent with that, never been certified. No. 14 Real estate -- real estate. No. 15 Boy, oh, boy. Compare him with the witness that Mr. Stephens put on who had been doing it for 40 years. 16 17 Never seen a REIT. Never drafted disclosures. That was the 18 testimony. 19 It's not because Mr. Stephens is trying to 20 embarrass him or anything, but the government is asking you to convict based on this evidence. 21 22 Would you rely on him in the most important of 23 your own affairs? With you? Your family? Your kids? 24 Reasonable doubt, Jurors. That is what this is. 25 Reasonable doubt.

1	"I can't recall. No. I can't recall. No. No.
2	No. No." And again, you know, he was a nice man.
3	But Mr. Martinez as well.
4	"Have you ever audited a lender?"
5	"No."
6	"Involved in real estate?"
7	"No."
8	"Audited a REIT, correct?"
9	"No."
10	"Auditor?"
11	"No. Me personally, no."
12	"Been on an audit committee?"
13	"No."
14	And we put aside that he just looked at it from
15	one perspective. And he reached the result that the
16	government wanted him to reach. Ever no. No. No.
17	Reasonable doubt, Jurors. It's all reasonable
18	doubt.
19	And this is the actual testimony. This is the
20	questions and the answers. Again, I'm sure he's a nice man,
21	but the question is, would you rely on this in the most
22	important of your own affairs? To conclude beyond a
23	reasonable doubt?
24	I suggest to you, Jurors, that the answer is no.
25	Toward the very end, he again said, when

1 Mr. Stephens was asking him, "I did not" -- "Do you contest 2 that those homes built at Shahan Prairie were built with 3 financing provided by III or IV?" 4 "I couldn't tell you either way." 5 He knew. I mean, surely, goodness, he's been working -- what did he say, how long he had been working on 6 7 the case? It was a long time, I think. I don't remember if he said five or six years. 8 9 I couldn't tell you either way. 10 That's reasonable doubt, Jurors. And then this 11 one, the last one which it's just almost hard to believe. 12 "Can you describe the difference to the men and 13 women of the Jury of what a land acquisition -- a land 14 acquisition loan is and what a development loan is?" Land 15 acquisition, development, related to this case? They took every computer, every document out of their place back in --16 17 six years ago. They knew what the case was about. The case 18 was indicted last fall. Surely, we knew what the issues were. Land 19 20 acquisition, land development. "I do not know with 21 certainty what each difference is. I do not know what the 22 difference is between a land acquisition loan and a 23 development loan is." 24 Jurors, that's reasonable doubt. That is 25 reasonable doubt.

1 The other thing that the Judge told you --2 Judge, may I ask you, how much --3 THE COURT: You have six minutes. 4 MR. LEWIS: Thank you. 5 The other thing the Judge indicated to you is common sense. And this is -- this is really what makes --6 7 look, I love the law, but what makes the jury system and this country the best in the world, the jury system, is 8 9 common sense. 10 The judge tells you in considering evidence, use your common sense. Make deductions that reason and common 11 12 sense would lead you to make. 13 And that's why, with all due respect to the 14 government, when you keep asking the question over and over 15 if the money went from V to III to pay distributions, would 16 that concern you? And over and over they got: "Yes, of 17 course." But it's a trick question. 18 It completely failed to recognize that there was a 19 transaction, a loan, a value-for-value transaction in the 20 middle, in the very middle. Refinancing your house. Paying off your credit card with part of that. That doesn't mean 21 22 that -- it's just -- it's a trick question. Isn't it 23 possible? 24 That is reasonable doubt, Jurors. 25 Also want you -- it's fair in using your common

1 I agree with that. Yes, this is not TV. I wish it sense. 2 was TV, but it's not TV. It is serious, serious business. 3 But your common sense will tell you in a fraud case, with 4 the FBI around and their resources for six years, what's 5 missing? Where are the undercover tapes? Where's the undercover interaction between the FBI? They do it all the 6 7 time. Where is the evidence of misappropriation of all the money? 8 9 Where is the evidence of unexplained wealth? 10 Living big. Going on plane trips. Buying -- spending like a mad man. Where is the evidence of shredding documents? 11 12 Where's the evidence of a co-conspirator at UDF or anywhere 13 who went over and said "Brandon, let's not put it on" -- or 14 the piece of evidence where Brandon -- I mean, they were 15 sending emails back and forth. How about an email that says: "Brandon to Jeff Gilpatrick. Don't disclose this to 16 17 anybody." 18 Nothing. Nothing like that. Nothing. 19 No video. No concealing records. No destroying records. 20 No shredding records. And the indictment itself, they've had six years to look. No evidence of any -- just anything. 21 22 That is reasonable doubt, Jurors. 23 Other -- no money, and, yeah, yes, there was no 24 money lost. I am going to say that. Would you want to know 25 that in a bank fraud case? No defendant took money they

1 There's nothing to contradict that in weren't entitled to. 2 the record. They're still operating business openly. It 3 wasn't a Ponzi scheme. It's not a Ponzi-like scheme. 4 As 5 soon as a Ponzi scheme is discovered, it completely collapses on itself. These people still did business and 6 7 still do. Jurors, in closing, reasonable doubt, it is a hard 8 9 quilty beyond a reasonable doubt. I mean, it is hard to get 10 It's not impossible, as the Judge said, but there 11 are so many -- the quality of the evidence matters. The 12 quantity of the evidence matters. 13 And when you push it up just a little bit and then 14 you start looking at the cross-examination and the evidence 15 of innocence, this case is not even close. Now, I'll leave it up, very quickly, and I suspect 16 17 the prosecutor will take it down. And if you leave it up 18 great, but if you don't --19 But these are questions, Jurors, that you should 20 ask and that the government should answer to you. How is it not reasonable doubt when the 21 22 Whitley Penn witnesses testified they were okay with UDF IV 23 and V -- I mean, with V -- yes, IV and V, with common 24 borrowers? How is that, in and of itself, not reasonable 25 doubt?

1 How is it not reasonable doubt when all the 2 investors benefit from the transactions at issue? And on 3 down. 4 How is there not reasonable doubt when every 5 expert, including Martinez, testified that Martinez's cash-tracing theory has never been accepted as legitimate in 6 7 any prior federal fraud prosecution? 8 Let me please say that one more time. 9 How is there not reasonable doubt, Government, 10 when every expert, including Martinez, testified that 11 Martinez's cash-tracing theory has never been accepted as 12 legitimate in any -- in any prior fraud prosecution. 13 Jurors, again, I thank you for your patience with 14 And I thank you for your time. And I truly would urge 15 you to go back, review the evidence, review the Judge's instructions, and I would urge you to reach the only, the 16 17 only fair and just and appropriate verdict, which is not 18 guilty as to Mr. Greenlaw, not guilty as to Mr. Wissink, not 19 quilty as to Ms. Obert, not quilty as to Mr. Jester, all 20 defendants, all counts. 21 And I thank you very much for your time. 22 MS. EGGERS: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to 23 put something up here for you, too. I'm going to put a binder that has 365 through 475. I'm going to put a binder 24

that has 398 through 408. I'm going to put a binder that

1 I'm going to put a binder that has 376 has 387 through 397. 2 through 386 in it and then 409. 3 None of these attorneys, not a one of them said 4 anything about any of the emails in here. 5 MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, I object. THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. 6 Ladies and gentlemen, you will remember the 7 evidence and the arguments. 8 9 They don't want you to look. There's MS. EGGERS: 10 no way to sit here and put each and every email up there. 11 You will have it to go back in the jury room. They don't want you to look at those. They don't want you to see what 12 13 is glaring. And what is glaring is these transactions were 14 being done every single month for one purpose, and that was 15 to get distributions out the door to earlier investors. One 16 purpose. 17 Yeah, they papered the file. They papered it real 18 good to make it look like Mehrdad Moayedi is requesting 19 draws when he wasn't, to make it look like Blake Buffington 20 was requesting draws when they weren't. The defendants in this case -- or the attorneys 21

have told you that this is just a disclosure case. It is in the disclosures that the defendants promised investors in V that they would not engage in affiliated transactions. lied.

22

23

24

Defendants used an analogy of balancing your
checkbook and suggested that's what they were doing. The
problem is, it is one person's checkbook with that analogy.
What we have here is the individuals who had invested in
UDF IV's money being used to balance UDF III's distributions
and financing. We have UDF V's investors' money being used
for somebody else.
That checkbook analogy doesn't hold. Going to
say, "Oh, well, it's just-in-time financing." The problem
with that is, the defendants are using just-in-time
financing of UDF IV's investors' money to pay somebody else.
That's the problem.
Each bucket of investors was owed a fiduciary
obligation and the defendants didn't care. The defendants
decided we'll just put it all together.
What was driving this ship was making sure these
happened like clockwork.
The defendants have repeatedly said that this
just-in-time financing strategy can be a legitimate business
model. And you know what? It may be. It may be. But they
got too greedy and they got overextended. They loaned out
so much cash that they couldn't make the investor
distributions.
So to bail themselves out, they had to steal from
Peter to pay Paul and paper the file along the way.

1 They say there's no evidence of intent. Then why 2 do all these paper cover ups, all the advance requests, all 3 the participation agreements. Why email -- I mean, since when does a borrower -- or excuse me -- a lender email a 4 5 borrower to tell them to take a draw on their loan to finance at the same rate? 6 The defendants would have you believe that their 7 business is so complex the government doesn't understand it. 8 9 Oh, it's real simple. You can read those bank statements 10 and you can see UDF III didn't have enough money in their 11 accounts. You can read the words of Todd Etter on 12 December 3rd of 2015, they couldn't even pay a \$1.25 million 13 quarterly payment that was woefully past due, well beyond 14 the grace period of 10 days. 15 UDF V sent money to III and IV to pay off loans and make distribution to earlier investors. That's real 16 17 simple, ladies and gentlemen. 18 Ponzi was an American scheme, too. 19 The technicalities the defendants rely on don't 20 change that. It doesn't matter that UDF got liens and other 21 benefits in return. And it doesn't matter that UDF often 22 had third-party borrowers to act as a go-between. They're 23 basically a shell. To come up here and suggest that Mehrdad 24 Moayedi was in control of any of those transactions. Come

25

on now.

At the end of the day, UDF V sent money to its 1 2 affiliates and its affiliates sent assets back in return. 3 You can see the money in those bank statements. 4 The defense questions the simplest of math and 5 says this theory has never been tested in a court of law. I'm going to say, ladies and gentlemen, it happens every 6 7 single day when we look at our own bank statements. Not enough money in this account, go to another account and get 8 9 The problem is here, these men and women were going to it. 10 other investors' money to get it. The forensic accountant cash-tracing method is a 11 theory. Again, bank statements don't lie. The money is in 12 13 there, you can watch it. The emails don't lie. 14 The advance request to draws on Centurion and 15 Buffington loans were not for Centurion and Buffington, they were for these guys to be able to get that 9.75 out the 16 17 door. 18 Confirmation bias. That's good. I'm not sure 19 what the confirmation bias of Mr. Eades was, or the 20 director, Mr. Kahane, or Ms. Lawson, the person that actually -- it sounds like she almost took heat because the 21 22 mother company was a co-sponsor to this and she wouldn't 23 agree to let their broker/dealer settle. Sounds like a lot 24 of confirmation bias for her. She even knew a forensic

accountant needed to get involved. And Scott Martinez is

1	the guy.
2	Mr. Kitchens is biased, probably not for
3	1.3 million. Mr. McCormick, no bias there for the
4	plaintiff. Mr. Ferguson, I think it was like over \$300,000
5	for three months' worth of work. Probably no bias there.
6	Defendants argue this was a good business in
7	making money. Read the emails, ladies and gentlemen. Some
8	of them are going to say things like this, Government's
9	Exhibit 518, this is somebody trying to get paid.
10	"This is the same invoice we've sent you for the
11	sixth time now. We were supposed to be paid several years
12	ago."
13	544B, "I have spoken with you several times and
14	each time you have told me you will get back to me and have
15	not. This is our final demand for payment."
16	552A, "Couple bills that are going to have to get
17	paid in the next week or two for us to continue on."
18	"I just finished a conversation with TBG about
19	past due bills. At the risk of sounding like Chicken
20	Little, I'm afraid we're hitting a wall where our ability to
21	stretch our dollar may be becoming a liability."
22	That's an employee of UDF telling a superior at
23	UDF this. That's in that email, Chicken Little.
24	This one right here, Government's Exhibit 301.
25	It's an email chain, I believe, between Ms. Tidwell and one

1	of the other ladies at UDF. We're talking about an advance
2	request.
3	"This is to pay investor distributions so we have
4	to ensure it goes out today. The ones we won't fund are the
5	actual draws to borrowers."
6	That tells you the tail's wagging the dog here.
7	That right there. We're going to fund the ones to pay the
8	investors distributions but those poor developers that have
9	to come each month to keep the lights on, we're going to
10	hold those back.
11	Mr. Wissink, "UDF III doesn't have the capital to
12	fund these draws, what avenues do we have for UDF IV to fund
13	a repayment on a Centurion to provide capital to UDF III on
14	Monday morning?"
15	Greenlaw, "Someone needs to fight FINRA."
16	This one's good. "This is the progression of
17	being addicted to distributions." That's from that man
18	seated right there to that man seated right there.
19	Mr. Jester, "Let's fund it from 5030. I can then
20	allocate some money to some of these new loans we'll be
21	closing in the next couple of weeks."
22	Aaron Richards, "That works. Have it pay down
23	1530 in UDF III."
24	Jester, "FYI let's remember to fix this once we
25	finalize some of the new deals."

1 "I have it printed out" -- I have printed this out 2 and put it in the fix-it file." 3 "That one's getting pretty big." 4 "Huge." 5 Government's Exhibit 310, "We need to identify an asset that we can fund \$3 million today from UDF IV to repay 6 7 1529 and 1026." Wissink, "We need 1.75 million today, and we can 8 9 figure out the rest later this week." 10 Richards, "Telling Renee Mueller he is wiring her money and she is to wire it back to UDF IV." On what planet 11 does that sound like a legitimate business? "We are going 12 13 to wire you money and then you are going to wire it to our 14 other bank account." 15 129A, Ms. Goodman talked about whether or not there has to be a contract or not a contract. Government's 16 17 Exhibit 96 speaks for itself. Whitley Penn was under the 18 impression there were executed contracts. And did we bring 19 in all of the projects and every person from all over the 20 state of Texas for that? No, we didn't, because we have Government's Exhibit 129A. Ms. Goodman didn't talk about 21 22 that one. 23 Matzinger, letter of intent and draft contract 24 submittal; there's no contract -- letter of intent and draft 25 submittal, no contract. 4S Ranch, no offer yet. Crossings

1 at Carmel Creek, heard Pulte and Ashton Woods are trying to 2 buy. Heather Glenn, it's a Megatel Source deal. Las 3 Fontanas, re-engaging, due diligence. Nor-Tex, letter of 4 5 intent submitted. Project is stalled. Park Village, needs to complete underwriting and submit an offer. 6 Reserve at Fair Oaks, another came in and had it 7 under contract and then dropped. Gilbert Tract, M/I Homes 8 9 has under contract. 10 We didn't need to bring in all the men and women across the state of Texas, because Mr. Gilpatrick laid it 11 all out there for you. Those right there, no contract. 12 13 Whitley Penn led to believe there was a contract. 14 Specific intent. Ladies and gentlemen, this is 15 not a situation where we have people that just got involved on Friday in securities fraud. These people are educated 16 17 people, one has a law degree. They did this and they did it 18 for years. And they honed their skills. 19 They specifically intended to tell the SEC and 20 everyone else that would read those UDF filings that they were not going to do related-party transaction. They made 21 that decision. 22 23 Other lenders, this Trez, or however you spell 24 that, and First Continental do it the same way. Ladies and

gentlemen, I don't know who Trez and First Continental are,

1 but I can tell you what's not at issue in this case is 2 what's in their SEC filings. It's always rich when somebody says, well, 3 4 somebody else is doing it, too. Well, that's not a defense. 5 Refinancing and land release payments. That was I go back to when does a lender tell a borrower 6 said a lot. 7 it's time to take another draw to pay down their own loan? Since when does a lender, at the end of the month, 8 9 on the very same day when that money is due and needed to 10 transfer to UDF III for distributions? When do they do 11 that? The developers' loans ultimately paid off. Again, 12 13 ladies and gentlemen, that is not a defense. The banks got 14 paid back eventually, that is not a defense. 15 It was a good deal for the developers. It doesn't sound like too good of a deal. Same interest rate from V to 16 17 IV, but okay, not a defense. It was a good working environment. Again, ladies 18 19 and gentlemen, that is not a defense to these crimes. 20 Defendants' arguments that they had friends and co-workers come in and said they had good character. 21 of those friends and co-workers testified that they knew 22 23 what the defendants were putting into the SEC filings and 24 telling investors. I wonder why they didn't ask that, huh?

A few things that show concealing the truth.

1 at that SK report, the spreadsheet, why not just say it's 2 future and anticipated contracts? Why not make sure it's 3 clear to Whitley Penn that they knew that. Not telling Mr. Kahane and the board of directors what they were doing. 4 And Defendant Greenlaw and Defendant Jester not at least 5 acknowledging that sales pitch. 6 7 Ladies and gentlemen, they knew. That email that Mr. Buffington sent, that hurt. That really hurt. 8 Because 9 those two men knew that if they came in here and 10 acknowledged that in October of 2013 this plan had been 11 hatched and they're telling Buffington one thing and telling 12 UDF V potential investors in an S11 they're going to do 13 They knew that was a problem. That shows you 14 evidence of their intent, not being truthful with you. 15 The defense says, "Well, the auditors thought it was okay." You know, auditors are not investigating 16 securities fraud. Auditors are not looking at every single 17 18 email. Heck, they're not even looking at every single bank 19 They're looking at the books and ledgers. They're 20 auditing financial statements and testing to see, well, we'll test 10 or so transactions here, we're going to test 21 22 and see if the numbers crunch, and it looks like it's 23 materially accurate. But Ms. Braislin, she was onto something. Too bad 24 25 Ms. Braislin, when she found this on February 19, 2014, too

1 bad she didn't call the FBI that day. 2 Look at Government Exhibit 101. She was onto something. They're making sure the credits and debits match 3 4 and they're checking the numbers. They're not investigating 5 securities fraud. Ms. Powell told you she did not know what she saw 6 in Government's Exhibit 101, but it was happening more than 7 once. You will have that in evidence. 8 9 MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, I object to that 10 testimony. It mischaracterizes the record. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. 12 Ladies and gentlemen, you will remember the 13 testimony. 14 The defendants picked the rules of MS. EGGERS: 15 the game, and they must live by their decision. The only business decision that changed was in their disclosures, and 16 17 Judge O'Connor has given you the definition of affiliate. 18 The other way wasn't working anymore. They needed to find 19 new people so they could pay Peter with Paul's money. 20 The defendants made a decision to engage in a scheme to defraud, and it was using subsequent investors' 21 22 money to pay distributions to earlier investors. 23 defendants made a decision to put investors at risk. 24 specifically told the SEC and the investing public they

25

would not do.

1 The defendants had to choose failure or fraud, and 2 they chose fraud. And they kept on and on and on and on. Ladies and gentlemen, this is why we're here. And 3 for them to suggest this was some great business. 4 Nobody 5 wanted to talk about Government's Exhibit 577. This is just going great, but they can't pay 1.25 million that they're 6 7 contractually obligated to pay. Remember Mr. Pelletier was like, "I mean, there's 8 9 nothing wrong with them not paying the money." 10 And Mr. Downey just happened to take a little note, says, "Well, they were under a contractual obligation 11 12 They could have stopped paying the to pay us. 13 distributions." But they didn't have enough money to do 14 both. Why? Because they were having to get it from V. 15 They were having to get it from IV. Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to find these 16 17 defendants guilty as charged. They engaged in a large-scale 18 scheme, and they did it month after month. And we're here because they were committing wire fraud that was affecting 19 20 financial institutions and putting them at risk. They were engaging in the conspiracy to commit 21 securities fraud, and they committed substantive acts of 22 23 securities fraud with each of those SEC filings that are 24 charged. I ask you to find them guilty. 25 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, that

1	is all you will hear. So you will retire here in a moment
2	to your jury room.
3	I will get the jury charge sent up to you. All of
4	the exhibits are in the jury room. So you will be able to
5	look at all of the exhibits that you want to look at, except
6	there are some exhibits that are electronic, so if you would
7	announce that now, please.
8	MS. EGGERS: Yes, your Honor.
9	There's a thumb drive with both parties' exhibits,
10	and any exhibit that was in an Excel spreadsheet or anything
11	that was over 100 pages, they're on the thumb drive so they
12	can be accessed that way. But all exhibits are on there as
13	well, but those are the once that will only be
14	electronically available.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, so do you
16	all agree with that?
17	Mr. Pelletier?
18	MR. PELLETIER: Yes, sir.
19	MR. STEPHENS: Yes, sir, your Honor.
20	MS. GOODMAN: Yes.
21	THE COURT: So if you want to look at an Excel
22	spreadsheet or if you want to look at an exhibit that was
23	more than 100 pages, it's going to be on the thumb drive.
24	We will get that set up for you. Just send us a note that
25	tells us you want to look at those. We will get those set

1	up for you. I just didn't want you looking for those
2	documents if they're not actually physically there. So
3	please remember that.
4	With that said, go and begin your deliberations.
5	Lunch should be up there. Remember, only deliberate when
6	all of you are in the room. At breaks, if some of you leave
7	the room for a stretch break, whatever, you have to stop
8	your deliberations.
9	(The jurors exited the courtroom.)
10	THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.
11	Anything else?
12	MS. EGGERS: No, your Honor.
13	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, can I just preserve?
14	Thank you, your Honor. And I appreciate you allowing me to
15	do this outside the presence of the jury.
16	I was trying to do it in a way that was not
17	interrupting the flow of the proceedings.
18	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
19	MR. STEPHENS: I do have some objection, both in
20	initial closing and counsel's rebuttal closing. And I will
21	just take them in order as they happened.
22	The first one, your Honor, is an objection that
23	the government has sought to have an instructive amendment
24	of the indictment by switching theories and arguing
25	omissions that did not tell.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was several references early in the introductory closing argument about what the executives did not tell the market, as opposed to the affirmative false representations they're charged with about what they said about their disclosures. So that's number one. Number two would relate to the argument on the issue of control in related-party transactions or affiliate transactions when they were discussing the definition of There's no evidence that the government's put control. forward that there's been a violation of the term "control." The evidence in the record came from Mr. Kitchens where he confirmed that -- the government in these transactions there is no control over Centurion. suggest otherwise contradicts the facts in the case, and the government knew it during the course of the closing argument. The third one is what is not a defense which came And it was any suggestion that the defendants had good character which came in, in spades in the testimony and is in the Court's instruction. The initial closing argument suggested to the jurors that they should disregard that evidence because it doesn't constitute a defense. That's legally and factually inaccurate, so we would object to that.

In the rebuttal closing, the start of the rebuttal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

closing was impugning the defense theories and suggesting that the defense lawyers are trying to deceive the jury as to what the evidence is. That's improper rebuttal argument. We would object to that. The last one relates to the Susan Powell testimony that she confirmed on cross-examination, which I demonstrated to the jury in my argument, that she understood and was aware and approved of the IV-to-III transactions and knew that they were occurring. The rebuttal closing just suggested that that's not the case. That's factually, inaccurate, and improper to close that way in rebuttal. THE COURT: Okay. Well, I instructed the Jury that they're to follow the instructions, so the instructions will tell them what they can and cannot convict for. So I think they're appropriately instructed and will follow that instruction. And then while not ruling, when you did object in the final argument, I did instruct the jury that they are the ones who will remember the evidence and what you-all So I did give them that instruction, and I think that said. applies across the board to your objection. So I will overrule those objections. Anything else? MS. EGGERS: No, your Honor. MR. STEPHENS: Nothing, your Honor.

1	MR. LEWIS: One brief side bar. Two minutes. One
2	minute.
3	THE COURT: Yes. Okay.
4	(A sidebar was had.)
5	(Recess.)
6	THE COURT: Okay. Let's be seated.
7	What's your response?
8	MS. EGGERS: Your Honor, the government exhibit
9	that concerns that specific topic are Government's Exhibits
10	420 and 498 to 507. I don't know if the defense has
11	identified any other exhibits.
12	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, we're still in the
13	process. We've got some of them, but I don't think we're
14	all the way through it yet.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Where are we?
16	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, we're just going
17	through the two last documents that will show a payoff. And
18	they're they're longer documents. They're trying to get
19	at them and then trying to find it. So we're doing it as
20	quick as we can, your Honor.
21	Thank you.
22	Your Honor, I apologize that took a while. We are
23	trying to do it as efficiently as we could.
24	So for us, we would agree with the numbers that
25	the government cited. To that, we would add Government's

1	Exhibit 507.1, and it's at page 6 inside the document. We
2	have Defense 3826 at page 54. Defendant 3828 and a range of
3	documents, Defendants' 3820 to 3840, which all relate to
4	this transaction.
5	And then three more, your Honor. Defendants' 115
6	and then Defendants' 118 at page 78 and defendant's 114 at
7	page 57, 57.
8	THE COURT: Okay. And what do you say?
9	MS. EGGERS: I'm sorry, your Honor, because I
10	didn't know what ones they are. I was just looking at them.
11	I need to look at the
12	THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
13	MS. EGGERS: I need to look at the actual party's
14	joint admitted exhibit list because 38 and 36 if I may
15	have one moment, your Honor. I'm sorry.
16	THE COURT: Yes.
17	MS. EGGERS: I'm not showing sorry. I'm sorry,
18	your Honor. I'm just double-checking.
19	THE COURT: Yes.
20	MS. EGGERS: I mean, this is including additional
21	records like a layout and that kind of stuff, which the
22	government is not saying that we have an objection to, but
23	the question seemed as though it was pretty specific. But,
24	obviously, whatever the Court would prefer to do.
25	I'm not really sure what 115 has to do I mean,

1	there appear to be defense exhibits that 115 is saying
2	that it's an email regarding a reimbursement Metro study, so
3	I'm not sure what that has to do with it. I'm sorry
4	THE COURT: The Defendants' Exhibit 115 is the
5	8-K.
6	MS. EGGERS: I'm sorry. Yes.
7	THE COURT: So it seems to me they're asking for
8	backup documents for Frisco 113, and the date is
9	12-22-20 and it's in the five cent, four cent amount. So
10	how is an 8-K or a 10-K a backup document?
11	MR. STEPHENS: It explains the transaction, your
12	Honor. It's specific to the transaction.
13	THE COURT: They're asking for backup documents.
14	And so let me what are your documents, 420?
15	MS. EGGERS: Government's Exhibit 420, your Honor,
16	is that bank sheet with the bank accounts that went behind
17	it and the cash flow projections. And then 498 through 507,
18	which would include 507.1, those are the email
19	communications and advance requests for Frisco 113.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And then okay. So you want
21	to so the defense then wants to introduce this 8-K,
22	that's at 115. A 10-K. Two 10-Ks.
23	MR. STEPHENS: And, your Honor, I can give you a
24	little background there.
25	THE COURT: Well, I don't really need any

1	background. They're asking for backup documents. I don't
2	see how a 10-K or 8-K is a back-up document.
3	MR. STEPHENS: The 10-Ks can separate those. The
4	10-Ks are going to demonstrate that the loan was paid off.
5	That's what I'm getting from my colleague.
6	THE COURT: But a backup document is a document
7	that backs up the transaction internally. These are public
8	disclosures. I don't think they're asking for where the
9	public disclosures explaining these documents are. So I
10	don't read it that way, I guess.
11	MR. STEPHENS: Well, so, as a jury note, your
12	Honor, I don't know exactly what they're asking for. We're
13	trying to make sure that we're being comprehensive in
14	response to them, given how many documents are in the case,
15	so that if this helps answer their question, which is what
16	we're trying to do is get them straight to the page cite on
17	those 10-Ks. If the question is, is the loan paid off,
18	that's what those documents are going to show them.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we do this well,
20	okay. So what do you say to 3820, for instance?
21	Ms. EGGERS: 3820 to 3840?
22	THE COURT: Yeah, Frisco 113 RSI Market Report,
23	3Q15, 3821 is an appraisal.
24	Let's bring them in.
25	MS. EGGERS: If we're including all those other

1	things, your Honor, there's also title records. If we're				
2	going to start including title records, I believe it's				
3	Government's Exhibit 318.				
4	THE COURT: Okay. We're just going to ask them				
5	what they want.				
6	MS. EGGERS: Yes, sir.				
7	(The jury was brought into court.)				
8	THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.				
9	All right. Who is our foreperson?				
10	Okay, ma'am. We've been going through documents				
11	trying to interpret the note, but I thought it would be				
12	better for us just to ask you.				
13	Tell me exactly what you're looking for, because				
14	we can read this very broadly, narrowly. However, we want				
15	to give you everything you want, and we don't want to under				
16	give you or over give you.				
17	So can you just explain for us what you're looking				
18	for?				
19	THE FOREPERSON: So one of the jurors asked if				
20	they're wanting to see the journal of the payoff for the				
21	retired loan from. I think it was 5056, if I'm not				
22	mistaken.				
23	THE COURT: Yes, you have 5056 here. Frisco 113,				
24	Retired 5056, UDF IV.				
25	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.				

1	THE COURT: And then you have the 1.3 ending in 05				
2	and 1.3 ending in 04.				
3	THE FOREPERSON: Correct. They're wanting to see				
4	the payoff documents for those.				
5	THE COURT: And when you say "payoff documents,"				
6	what exactly				
7	THE FOREPERSON: The lien releases.				
8	THE COURT: The lien releases.				
9	And do you remember seeing those presented to you				
10	during the trial, or you just know they exist and they're in				
11	the documents?				
12	THE FOREPERSON: So one of the jurors does not				
13	remember seeing that.				
14	THE COURT: Yes.				
15	THE FOREPERSON: We don't remember seeing that.				
16	But we remember an email, where it says, "Please use these				
17	funds to retire Loan 5056."				
18	THE COURT: Yes.				
19	THE FOREPERSON: And then those funds went back				
20	to was it IV? IV.				
21	THE COURT: Whichever one.				
22	THE FOREPERSON: Whichever one.				
23	THE COURT: Yes, I'm with you on that.				
24	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.				
25	THE COURT: So you for sure want the email?				

1	THE FOREPERSON: Yes. Well, we have the email.
2	We saw the email.
3	THE COURT: You have the email?
4	THE FOREPERSON: So we don't need the email.
5	THE COURT: So you don't need the email?
6	THE FOREPERSON: I think where the issue is coming
7	in is we're having an issue with the disclosures on
8	affiliate and common borrower. That's where we're stuck.
9	THE COURT: Got you. Got you.
10	THE FOREPERSON: So that's where it's kind of
11	iffy. So we're looking at the disclosures. And that wire
12	is kind of where we're stuck
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	THE FOREPERSON: because we're thinking that,
15	if that amount where it says, "retired," we're thinking
16	paid off, that means there should be some loan documents
17	there to show
18	THE COURT: I see.
19	THE FOREPERSON: that that loan was paid off.
20	THE COURT: All right.
21	THE FOREPERSON: And then, they're taking those
22	funds, I think it's 04, and bringing it back to the same
23	loan, right?
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	THE FOREPERSON: So that means the collateral

1	should be on this end, instead of that end.
2	THE COURT: I think that helps quite a bit. We've
3	been working since the note came. Let us go back to work.
4	If we have other questions, we may bring you back
5	down here to ask you again.
6	THE FOREPERSON: Okay.
7	THE COURT: But thank you for working so hard. We
8	appreciate it very much. And we'll get right to work. So
9	if you'll go back and wait for us, we'll get it to you as
10	soon as we can.
11	(The following proceedings were had outside the
12	presence of the jury.)
13	THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.
14	All right. So now what do you all say?
15	MS. EGGERS: I would say, your Honor, to also add
16	Government's Exhibit 318, and Government's Exhibit 323,
17	which will be the real property records that were filed in
18	the court record. And then also the title company records,
19	your Honor, based upon what was described to us.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So are some of these documents
21	electronic, or are they all hard copy, or a mix?
22	MS. EGGERS: So with regards, obviously, to the
23	8-Ks and that kind of thing the defense was requesting,
24	those are going to be over a hundred pages. So they're
25	digital.

1	THE COURT: Digital.					
2	MS. EGGERS: The 323 that I just cited, that's 93					
3	pages. So that would have been in paper.					
4	Let me see. I'm pretty sure 318 is two					
5	different PDFs. So it's going to be rather large, your					
6	Honor, because there's a 318.1 and a 318.2, but it's the					
7	receipts and disbursement ledger for Frisco 113, so					
8	It's actually just two PDFs, one of them is 47					
9	pages, so it will be printed. That's, again, the supplement					
10	to the title company.					
11	And then 318.2, and there's a 318 all the way					
12	to 318.4, so					
13	But those are the title company records, which					
14	hearing the description, that sounds like what they're					
15	possibly looking for.					
16	THE COURT: And are your documents in hard copy or					
17	digital, these exhibits?					
18	MR. STEPHENS: Hard copy.					
19	THE COURT: They are in hard copy?					
20	MR. STEPHENS: Correct.					
21	THE COURT: All right. And in terms of the					
22	digital presentation, what do we have set up for them to					
23	look at?					
24	MS. EGGERS: They have a laptop, your Honor, back					
25	there for the digital.					

1	THE COURT: They do?
2	MS. EGGERS: They do. It's unencrypted. I mean,
3	I think there's a password, they have to initially log on.
4	And they have a thumb drive with both parties' exhibits on
5	it. So they have them both digitally and printed.
6	THE COURT: All right. So I think what I'll say
7	then is, in response to your note, we refer you to: I'll
8	list all of these exhibits. You have some pinpoint cites.
9	And I think I need to say, you know, please note
10	these will be all will be hard copies, except for
11	whatever exhibits, they will be digital.
12	MS. EGGERS: Let me double-check and make sure
13	that
14	THE COURT: Because all of theirs are hard copies.
15	MS. EGGERS: Yeah, ours might all be hard copy
16	too, your Honor. I'm just double-checking one more.
17	Because I haven't seen something yet that was over
18	100 pages. So they're quite possibly all right there in
19	hard copy. I believe all the government's are in hard copy.
20	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, and with that
21	additional information from the Jury, we are citing to
22	Defendants' 3820 through 3840.
23	THE COURT: You already did.
24	MR. STEPHENS: And I'm just confirming that
25	THE COURT: But all of those were admitted or not

1	admitted?
2	MS. EGGERS: They were.
3	MR. STEPHENS: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Yes, okay. Right. So give me a
5	second to write this out.
6	Yes?
7	MR. STEPHENS: And, your Honor, I'm sorry. I'm
8	just confirming that you still have for us Government's
9	THE COURT: 507 is in.
10	MR. STEPHENS: 507.1 and .6.
11	THE COURT: Well, I'm just giving them 507.
12	MR. STEPHENS: Okay.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Go show that to them. Just go
14	show it to them.
15	MS. EGGERS: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: Are we good?
17	MR. STEPHENS: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Okay. I will sign it now and Melissa
19	will take it in.
20	Okay. We will wait to hear from them. They had
21	earlier indicated they were going to leave at 6. I don't
22	know if that's still the case or not.
23	MR. PELLETIER: Judge, do you bring them out
24	before you release them or do you just release them?
25	THE COURT: I'll just release them, and we'll let

```
1
     you know that they're released.
 2
           (The proceedings adjourned at 5:45 p.m.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 1601

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Zoie M. Williams, RMR, RDR, FCCR certify that the
4	foregoing is a transcript from the record of the proceedings
5	in the foregoing entitled matter.
6	I further certify that the transcript fees format comply
7	with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial
8	Conference of the United States.
9	This 21st day of January 2022.
10	
11	s/ Zoie M. Williams s/ Kelli Ann Willis
12	Official Court Reporters The Northern District of Texas
13	Fort Worth/Dallas Divisions
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	113 1529:25 1534:14	2(a) 1474:13	318.4 1597:12
\$	1546:23,24 1591:8,19 1592:22 1593:23	20 1505:2 1539:25	323 1596:16 1597:2
\$1.2 1526:11	1597:7	1552:2	349 1504:10
\$1.25 1575:12	114 1590:6	2008 1523:5	35 1519:18
\$10.7 1546:23	115 1590:5,25 1591:1,4,	2011 1461:25 1488:15, 21	350 1504:10,23
\$100 1554:19	22	2012 1523:5	36 1590:14
\$11 1550:1	118 1590:6	2013 1526:10,23	365 1572:24
\$145,000 1534:18	12 1475:22 1476:17 1539:24	1582:10	376 1573:1
\$25,000 1562:3,13	12-22-20 1591:9	2014 1491:3,9,11	38 1590:14
1563:7	1248(2) 1476:24	1498:17 1525:5,22 1526:10,23 1528:19	3820 1590:3 1592:20,2
\$3 1579:6	129A 1579:15,21	1582:25	1598:22
\$300,000 1577:4	13 1537:23 1555:7	2015 1461:25 1500:11	3821 1592:23
\$7 1554:18	1343 1464:15,21	1520:7 1525:11 1575:12	3826 1590:2
	1466:19	2016 1511:6 1520:7	3828 1590:2
0	1348 1470:23 1471:3	1525:17 1534:22	3840 1590:3 1592:21 1598:22
04 1594:2 1595:22	1348(1) 1474:16	2017 1511:6 1520:8	386 1573:2
05 1594:1	1475:10,12 1476:24	2018 1511:6	387 1573:1
4	1348(2) 1474:24 1476:1,3	2019 1511:8	3900 1552:15
1	1349 1464:14,16	2020 1511:9 1525:2	3905 1552:14
1 1461:24 1494:24	1470:22,24	1531:13	3924 1552:15
1495:18	14 1525:20 1527:1	2021 1511:10	397 1573:1
1.25 1490:21 1584:6	15 1500:11	22 1554:17	398 1572:25
1.3 1577:3 1594:1,2	15(d) 1475:24 1476:19	24 1525:5	3Q15 1592:23
1.75 1579:8	1529 1579:7	25 1520:12	3rd 1575:12
1.8 1512:18	1530 1578:23	29 1461:25	31 u 1373.12
10 1502:6 1505:2 1509:8 1575:14	16 1501:21	3	4
1582:21	17 1505:23		40 4554 04 4554 5 00
10-K 1495:25 1498:17	18 1464:14,16,20	3 1502:16 1505:22	40 1551:21 1554:5,22 1566:16
1499:14,22 1591:10,22 1592:2	1466:18 1470:22,24 1471:3 1474:12,16,23	30 1520:12	4000 1552:16
10-ks 1591:22 1592:3,	1475:11 1476:2 1510:5	3000 1552:16	408 1572:25
4,17	1550:14	301 1577:24	409 1504:23 1573:2
10-Q 1495:25 1500:12	19 1539:25 1582:25	31 1554:14,15	410 1488:17 1504:22
1501:2,21	1934 1474:21 1475:6, 23,25 1476:18,20	310 1579:5	412 1500:8
100 1585:11,23 1598:18		318 1593:3 1596:16	413 1503:1,13
101 1583:2,7	2	1597:4,11	414 1505:8
1026 1579:7	2 4405-0 40 4500 47	318.1 1597:6	420 1500:18,20 1501:1
11 1526:14,19 1527:25	2 1485:2,19 1508:17 1542:24	318.2 1597:6,11	1589:10 1591:14,15

Case 4:21-cr-00289-O Document 308 Filed 01/29/22 Page 155 of 182 PageID 13473

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) 4:21-cr-289-O Vol 8 January 20, 2022

		•	
429 1507:15		19,22 1554:18 1576:8	1575:22
455 1500:6	8	1579:14 1582:19	acted 1467:8 1468:23
47 1597:8	8-K 1591:5,10,21	accountant 1500:19 1545:24 1561:14	1470:11 1476:13 1490:12 1514:12
475 1572:24	1592:2	1566:12 1576:11,25	1538:3,10 1539:11
498 1589:10 1591:17	8-ks 1596:23	accountants 1565:19	1557:8
4S 1579:25	80 1551:3	accounting 1529:23	acting 1479:8 1540:17
4th 1528:24	81 1547:1	1530:2 1551:12 1554:20 1557:5 1566:3	1545:9,15,24 1557:11 1565:20
5	9	accounts 1499:9 1500:21 1520:17	action 1463:6 1468:1 1478:4 1480:16
F 4520.46	9 1502:3,4,6 1505:12	1521:6 1541:25	1492:19 1543:6
5 1538:16	9.75 1507:5 1576:16	1549:16,21,23 1575:11 1591:16	activity 1511:23
5030 1578:19	93 1597:2	accuracy 1458:20	acts 1467:23 1474:7 1477:7 1479:10,11,13,
5056 1593:21,23,24 1594:17		accurate 1457:23	15 1481:14 1534:9
507 1589:10 1591:17	96 1491:8 1528:17 1579:17	1536:18 1549:12 1553:12 1582:23	1584:22 actual 1457:9 1541:1
1599:9,11	Α	accused 1462:20	1567:19 1578:5
507.1 1590:1 1591:18 1599:10		1479:16	1590:13
518 1577:9	Aaron 1523:3 1527:5	accuses 1473:2	Adams 1526:25 1527:4 1532:6
53 1505:2 1550:15	1529:20 1530:1,5 1534:11 1578:22	ACH 1504:17	add 1492:3 1589:25
54 1590:2	abetted 1479:22	acknowledge 1503:6	1596:15
544B 1577:13	abetting 1474:12	1542:12	added 1528:2
552A 1577:16	ability 1458:16 1577:20	acknowledged 1545:7 1582:10	addicted 1578:17
57 1590:7	absolutely 1555:25		additional 1530:13
577 1502:14 1584:5	accept 1457:22	acknowledging 1582:6	1590:20 1598:21
5:45 1600:2	1461:12,14	acquire 1543:22,24	Additionally 1467:10
3.43 1000.2	accepted 1454:21	1544:21	address 1565:2
6	1572:6,11	acquiring 1544:10	addressed 1463:2
6 1498:19 1500:15	access 1512:22 1520:17 1551:5	acquisition 1546:24, 25 1568:13,14,15,20,22	1468:14 1478:16 adjourned 1600:2
1590:1 1599:10,21	accessed 1585:12	acquit 1455:7 1470:17	admissible 1456:15
60 1502:10 1505:3	accident 1463:19	1514:9,15 1531:11	admit 1521:15,16
60-month 1551:4	accomplish 1464:25	1537:20 1538:7 1558:22	admitted 1460:14
64A 1453:6,8,11,14	1471:7 1473:4,7,10,16,	acres 1547:1	1548:12 1562:25
6th 1528:24	20	act 1455:18 1462:5	1590:14 1598:25 1599:1
	accomplished 1479:4	1463:17 1466:15	
7	accomplishing 1466:6 1469:12	1467:24 1468:16	Adrianna 1555:24
7 4400:22	1472:14	1469:22 1472:23 1474:21,22 1475:6,7,	advance 1490:14,17 1496:25 1504:19
7 1499:23	account 1504:20	23,24 1476:18,19	1506:10 1525:19,21
7,000 1519:25		1477:8 1479:2 1493:18	1554:3 1575:2 1576:14

Index: 429..advance

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) Vol 8 January 20, 2022

4:21-cr-289-O advances 1466:15 1472:23 **affairs** 1455:20 1560:10,11 1563:9 1564:7 1565:12 1566:23 1567:22 affect 1460:21 1470:9 1515:12 affected 1467:14 1470:7 1484:6 1491:23 1494:2 1541:15 affecting 1464:11,13, 19 1486:11 1491:19 1492:12 1494:6 1541:6 1584:19 affects 1470:4 affiliate 1478:17 1489:13 1497:13,18 1503:3,9,18,21 1504:2 1508:2 1540:7.11.20 1542:9 1544:18 1545:12 1547:3 1583:17 1587:7 1595:8 affiliated 1503:19 1504:5,7 1519:7,10 1521:20 1542:14 1547:2,4,8,9,15 1554:1, 6,9 1573:24 affiliated-party 1587:3

1518:21 1566:10

affiliates 1498:5 1500:4 1542:12 1543:22,23 1576:2

affirmative 1480:24

afraid 1577:20

agent 1465:2 1471:9 1479:5 1500:18 1510:22 1512:3

agents 1519:23

agree 1467:24 1473:23, 25 1474:2,5 1477:7 1481:18 1495:10 1541:19 1555:23 1560:20 1570:1 1576:23 1585:16 1589:24

agreed 1465:8 1466:3

1471:16 1472:11 1473:23 1474:1.4 1486:17 1487:21 1502:5 1508:4 1548:19

agreement 1453:9 1464:24 1465:11,24 1471:6,18 1472:6 1473:4,6,9,15,19 1477:12 1481:23 1486:19 1487:5,17 1488:6,7 1541:2,21

agreements 1575:3 **ahead** 1590:12

aid 1480:25

aided 1479:21

aiding 1474:11

aims 1466:11 1472:20

Alice 1502:4 1516:2 1518:4

alleged 1462:6 1465:16,24 1466:2,4,6 1469:1,7,12,19 1471:23 1472:6,10,12,13 1473:14,18,24 1477:22 1479:2 1487:23 1488:2

Alliance 1513:9

allocate 1578:20

allocation 1500:5

allowable 1548:5

allowed 1485:3 1530:25

allowing 1586:14

alternative 1467:23 1475:8 1477:6

amendment 1586:23

America 1506:19 1508:19 1515:22 1537:21 1540:9

American 1575:18

amount 1492:23 1591:9 1595:15

amounts 1534:23

analogy 1574:1,3,8

analysis 1456:7 1527:18.20 1548:24 1553:8

analyst 1510:23 1546:21 1547:8

analytical 1549:11

analyze 1536:19 1548:22

analyzed 1536:14 1540:24

Andreatta 1526:9 1534:2

Anne 1502:4 1516:2 1518:4

announce 1585:7

annual 1498:17

Ansley 1522:13 1525:1

answers 1563:14 1567:20

anticipated 1547:22 1582:2

anymore 1583:18

apologize 1522:12 1589:22

applies 1484:9 1529:12 1531:6 1556:23 1558:16,22 1588:21

apply 1453:25 1454:2, 15 1492:14,17 1494:16 1543:9

appraisal 1592:23

approach 1560:15

appropriately 1588:15

approve 1518:17

approved 1504:2,5,8 1588:8

area 1545:7,8,15

arque 1508:7 1577:6

arguing 1586:24

argument 1485:7 1497:14 1521:5 1587:2, 6,16,21 1588:3,7,18

arguments 1456:1 1506:13 1508:14 1573:8 1581:20

Index: advances..attorney

arrive 1540:18

arrived 1553:10

arriving 1453:25 1456:21 1556:20

artifice 1474:18.25 1475:15 1476:6 1477:18 1495:2,5,20 1496:18,20 1542:1,7

Ashton 1580:1

asks 1483:24 1484:2

aspect 1493:21 1536:17

aspects 1486:15

assembled 1466:11 1472:19

asserts 1457:9

asset 1523:2.4.5.6 1528:6,11 1532:12 1533:11 1543:24,25 1579:6

assets 1544:9,10 1576:2

assist 1461:6 1480:25

assisted 1533:10

associate 1479:16 1480:18

assume 1456:17 1523:20,22,23,24 1524:1,3

attach 1463:5

attempt 1469:18 1474:18,25 1495:1,4 1512:2 1533:19

attempted 1475:15 1476:6,9 1495:20 1496:8 1542:1

attempting 1474:10,14 1475:9 1476:22

attention 1454:12 1456:5 1509:17 1527:6

attorney 1543:5

attorneys 1573:3,21 audit 1545:23 1546:15 1547:23 1555:6,16,17 1567:12

audited 1567:4,8

auditing 1582:20

auditor 1546:20 1563:13 1565:17 1566:4 1567:10

auditors 1491:4,9 1522:24 1531:4 1540:15,17 1545:6,19 1547:7 1548:9 1550:20, 21,22,24 1551:7 1582:15,16,17

August 1525:21 1526:10

author 1530:5

avenues 1578:12

avoid 1508:2 aware 1588:8

В

back 1485:14 1491:5,9 1501:14 1505:15 1506:11,22 1508:9,16 1515:14 1522:1 1526:16 1535:25 1536:6 1537:25 1542:3 1545:22 1550:9 1555:14 1561:3 1568:16 1570:15 1572:15 1573:11 1576:2 1577:14 1578:10 1579:11 1581:6,14 1594:19 1595:22 1596:3,4,9 1597:24

back-up 1502:2 1592:2

background 1591:24 1592:1

backroom 1506:7

backs 1592:7

backup 1591:8,10,13 1592:1,6

bad 1468:19 1493:20 1508:19 1539:9 1582:24 1583:1

bail 1574:24

Baker 1513:5

balance 1483:11 1574:5

balanced 1515:19

balancing 1574:1

bank 1487:14 1488:5 1489:12 1491:25 1492:1,4,7,8,9 1498:19, 20 1499:4,5,8 1500:15, 20,21 1501:8,24 1504:4,20 1505:10 1506:24 1507:21 1509:25 1512:20 1516:3,4,6,8 1517:24 1520:17 1521:6 1549:16,17 1570:25 1575:9 1576:3,7,12 1579:14 1582:18 1591:16

Bank's 1499:1

bankers 1517:16

banks 1492:1 1494:3 1506:22 1512:5 1553:3 1581:13

bar 1589:1

Bascha 1526:21

base 1454:17 1492:4

based 1455:14 1456:15 1491:4,10 1524:2 1528:21 1529:5,6 1532:7 1546:8 1551:23 1552:1,4 1560:2 1561:5 1563:9 1566:21 1596:19

basically 1496:17 1524:11 1536:8 1575:23

basis 1540:9

bear 1459:8 1483:7 1552:14

begin 1453:16 1558:13 1586:4

beginning 1507:19

begins 1454:25

behalf 1534:24 1535:10

belief 1470:13,16 1514:14,17 1531:10 1533:3 1538:4,7

beliefs 1482:10

believability 1454:3 1457:25

Believable 1563:7

believed 1519:7,8,14

believes 1534:3

bell 1553:20

benefit 1548:1,23 1564:17,21 1572:2

benefited 1512:21

benefiting 1543:3 1553:7

benefits 1533:16 1549:13,14 1552:22 1553:6 1575:21

Benjamin 1483:19

bias 1482:2,6 1485:4 1508:11 1536:11 1548:20 1549:9 1550:2 1552:7 1553:9 1576:18, 19,24 1577:3,5

biased 1577:2

big 1488:17 1500:17 1519:13 1570:10 1579:3

bill 1515:16

billion 1511:1,2,7 1512:18

bills 1577:16,19

binder 1572:24,25 1573:1

binders 1527:25

binding 1456:9

bit 1494:2 1514:21 1535:25 1536:4 1542:9 1555:5 1556:21 1571:13 1596:2 **Blake** 1490:23 1505:22 1524:22 1573:19

Index: attorneys..bring

blame 1563:17

blank 1483:16,19,22,25

blindfold 1485:6

board 1491:15 1503:15,20 1533:7 1582:4 1588:21

Bodwell 1546:15 1555:6

bond 1477:11

books 1582:19

borrower 1546:17 1547:21 1548:2,5 1549:3,4 1552:25 1553:17 1554:1 1575:4, 5 1581:6 1595:8

borrower's 1546:24,25

borrowers 1516:17,24 1523:17,18 1527:21 1528:12 1529:16,20 1530:21 1533:16 1546:11,12,14 1547:13, 16 1571:24 1575:22 1578:5

borrowing 1492:4

bottom 1484:14 1529:2

bought 1478:1

boy 1558:15 1566:15

Braislin 1555:19 1582:24,25

Brandon 1458:22 1483:25 1522:9,17,20 1523:1,5,20 1528:4 1531:1 1532:15,16 1533:3,17,25 1570:13, 14,16

break 1496:15 1541:21 1586:7

breaks 1586:6

Breault 1517:1,7 1519:16

bright 1502:4

bring 1468:2 1478:5 1479:17 1483:5 1485:7

1492:20 1513:6 1521:2 1579:18 1580:10 1592:24 1596:4 1599:23

bringing 1595:22

broadly 1593:14

broker/dealer 1516:23 1547:11 1576:23

brought 1485:21 1505:15 1520:9 1526:20 1527:23 1530:5 1534:12 1537:18 1555:14 1593:7

Brown 1502:4 1516:2 1518:4

browsing 1490:8

bucket 1574:13

budgeting 1524:13

Buffington 1490:23 1498:5 1524:22,23,24 1525:18,20,22 1526:4, 6,14 1528:10 1532:24, 25 1533:10,12 1573:19 1576:15 1582:8,11

Buffington's 1505:22

build 1553:1

building 1510:4

built 1568:2

bulk 1552:24

burden 1454:3 1455:5, 9 1459:10 1514:6 1520:25 1537:14,16,17, 20 1558:8,15,18 1559:7,9 1560:17,18, 19,22 1561:6,7 1563:18

Burkhardt 1523:8,12 1524:7

business 1469:24 1510:3,12 1512:3,9,19, 20 1515:18,22 1517:4, 15 1518:9 1520:19 1521:17 1524:12,15,16, 19,20,21 1525:13,17 1526:15 1531:2 1532:5 1533:18,19 1548:9 1550:11,23,24 1553:3,7 1555:10 1561:1 1563:23 1566:3 1570:2 1571:3,6 1574:19 1575:8 1577:6 1579:12 1583:16 1584:4

businesses 1515:23, 25

buy 1517:7,9 1580:2

buying 1517:12 1570:10

C

cake 1495:15

call 1456:4 1495:14 1520:3 1583:1

called 1462:6 1514:23 1515:15 1519:24 1559:13

calling 1459:10

calls 1528:13

capable 1463:1 1468:13 1478:15 1493:12

capital 1491:25 1505:10 1512:18 1516:6 1520:16 1578:11,13

Cara 1458:22 1483:22

card 1569:21

care 1574:14

careful 1455:15 1560:3

carefully 1503:24 1556:17

carelessness

1463:13,14

Carmel 1580:1

carried 1466:3 1472:11 1487:21

Carroci 1548:11

carry 1469:18

carrying 1466:20

case 1454:2,5 1455:16 1456:4,9,19 1458:3,11

1459:9 1460:2 1461:18 1462:8,17 1464:2,4,7 1478:25 1481:24 1506:14 1508:12,23 1510:1 1521:25 1522:16,21,22,25 1523:8,19 1525:17 1529:14,17 1530:6 1532:11 1533:2 1534:1 1535:9,12 1536:9,23 1539:6,14 1540:16 1541:10 1542:16 1543:1,6 1545:1,11 1553:12,21 1556:20 1559:25 1560:4,15 1561:7 1568:7,15,17 1570:3,25 1571:15 1573:21,22 1581:1 1587:14 1588:10 1592:14 1599:22

Casey 1506:6 1523:4 1561:13

cash 1489:5 1504:17 1527:20 1529:8 1549:20 1552:4 1553:14 1554:10,11,14, 19,24 1555:3 1574:22 1591:17

cash-tracing 1549:1 1551:14,16,24 1572:6, 11 1576:11

casting 1563:17

catching 1488:5

category 1560:14

caught 1488:7

caused 1467:4 1469:17 1489:20

causing 1498:14

cease 1525:15

cent 1591:9

center 1523:16

Centurion 1498:5 1506:8 1523:10 1530:21 1542:15,20 1546:24 1547:3 1553:19 1561:14 1562:3,13 1576:14,15 1578:13 1587:13

certainty 1568:21
certainty 1568:21
certificate 1477:11,14,
15
certified 1566:13
certifies 1525:23
certify 1525:25
Cetera 1497:8
chain 1457:10 1577:25
challenges 1522:23

5 1575:20 **changed** 1525:24

change 1482:8 1562:4,

Index: bringing..cheat

Chapter 1542:24

1583:16

character 1455:17 1459:25 1460:3,4,7 1515:2,3 1518:8,9 1520:22 1533:22,23,24 1534:1 1538:11,19,23, 25 1560:7 1581:21 1587:19

charge 1453:17 1454:23 1467:16 1473:17 1474:9 1477:1 1483:11 1484:17 1497:10 1585:3

charged 1460:5 1462:4,14,20 1464:12 1465:8 1467:23 1470:20 1471:16 1473:20 1477:7 1480:10 1481:7,13 1486:23 1487:22 1515:4 1540:3 1584:17, 24 1587:4

charges 1461:19 1536:9 1541:1

chart 1464:3 1488:17 1498:8,9,22 1499:5 1502:25 1503:1 1507:24 1551:1

charts 1463:24 1507:22 1553:18

cheat 1468:5 1478:8 1493:3 1539:18,22 1557:12

check 1554:19 complex 1565:6 1588:1.9 1468:17 1472:17 1474:6 1477:8 1479:13. 1575:8 **checkbook** 1515:19 co-conspirator 20 1480:3,11 1481:2,3, **complied** 1543:13 1570:12 1574:2,3,8 4,10 1493:18 1506:21 co-conspirators **checking** 1554:18 1584:22 comprehensive 1583:4 1502:10 1592:13 **committee** 1567:12 **co-counsel** 1522:12 **computer** 1568:16 Cheryl 1555:21 committing 1467:17 1473:3 1474:14 1475:9 **Chicken** 1577:19,23 co-sponsor 1576:22 concealing 1499:17 1476:21 1477:1 1500:15 1501:3 **choice** 1463:6 co-workers 1581:21, 1584:19 1570:19 1581:25 22 choose 1584:1 commodity 1475:3,4 conceals 1468:9 Code 1464:14,16,20 1478:12 1493:9 **chose** 1584:2 1466:18 1470:22,24 **common** 1455:15 1456:24 1457:1 chronology 1504:13 1471:3 1474:13.16.23 concern 1569:16 1466:11 1472:19 1475:12 1476:3 concerned 1457:4 circumstances 1478:19 1497:20 collapse 1511:2 1457:11 1462:12 1516:17,24 1528:6 collapses 1511:15 1546:10,12,13,17 **concerns** 1495:24 circumstantial 1571:6 1547:13,16,21 1548:1,5 1499:14,16 1501:6,7,21 1457:5,10,13,15 1549:3,4 1552:25 1589:9 1505:14,18 collapsing 1511:8 1553:17 1560:3 1569:6, cite 1592:16 **concert** 1479:6 9,11,25 1570:3 1571:23 collateral 1517:21 1595:8 cited 1589:25 1597:2 1523:22,24 1595:25 **conclude** 1567:22 collateralized 1512:16 **commonly** 1477:13 concluded 1525:18 cites 1598:8 communicate 1483:3 citing 1598:21 colleague 1533:23 conclusion 1459:6 1538:12 1592:5 1483:1 1535:1 1540:18, communication citizen 1459:25 22 1545:10,25 1549:7,8 1466:20 1469:15 colleagues 1536:3 1554:12 1565:20 City 1489:25 1493:23 **collect** 1527:2 conclusions 1457:1 civil 1561:7 communications Collin 1547:1 1545:11 1467:5 1469:9,11,21,23 **claims** 1526:5 1591:19 **Columbia** 1463:23 **conduct** 1462:5 class 1474:20 1475:5 1463:16 1468:23 communities 1510:4 comment 1518:18 1477:22 1479:11,13 **clean** 1455:1 1514:2 companies 1540:8 1480:24 1539:12 1537:10 1558:7,13 **commerce** 1463:20 1467:6 1469:18 company 1489:25 conducted 1527:18 clear 1488:23 1492:22 1489:21 1533:20 1490:7 1491:12,13 1536:12 1550:16 1553:20 1510:12 1511:13 commission 1460:5 1582:3 conducting 1512:20 1517:2 1519:25 1527:1 1480:4 1515:4 1548:24 1552:2 **client** 1537:4 1540:5,7,11,12 1551:5, 1554:22 **commit** 1460:8 12 1576:22 1596:18 clockwork 1574:17 1464:10,12,17 1465:8 1597:10,13 confidence 1519:25 close 1521:24 1535:6 1470:19,21,25 1471:16 company's 1546:22 confirm 1553:9 1473:3 1474:14 1475:9 1571:15 1588:11 1476:22 1479:10 Compare 1566:15 confirmation 1536:11 closed 1453:16 1486:11,17,24 1487:18 1548:20 1550:2 1552:7 1520:17 comparison 1508:1 1491:23 1492:11 1576:18,19,24 1494:6,15,17,19 closely 1469:16 compatible 1527:18 **confirmed** 1587:12 1532:15 1533:3 1539:1 **closing** 1485:7 complete 1580:6 1540:25 1541:1,2,18,19 1588:6 1508:14 1521:4 1584:21 completely 1541:10 confirming 1549:9 1538:11 1571:8 **committed** 1461:20, 1553:16 1564:10 1598:24 1599:8 1578:21 1586:20 22,24 1466:9 1467:24 1569:18 1571:5 1587:2,15,21,25

Index: check..confirming

connected 1477:20 connection 1473:8,12

1474:19 1475:2,16 1476:10 1477:17,21 1495:3,8,21 1496:11, 18,19

connotes 1468:20

conscious 1468:4 1478:7 1493:2 1539:17, 21

consequence 1481:5,

consequences 1454:16

consideration 1453:22 1455:15

1462:13,22 1481:25 1560:1,3

considerations 1458:20

considered 1462:16, 17 1503:20,25 1504:3,6 1518:20 1549:14

consistent 1460:19 1544:15 1559:11 1566:13

consistently 1512:8

conspiracies 1522:9

conspiracy 1464:10, 12,24 1465:2,14,20 1466:5,13,15,16 1470:19,21 1471:6,9,21 1472:2,13,21,23 1473:3 1481:3,5,7,9,12 1486:11,13,15,23,24 1487:2,7,8,11,13,14,15, 22,23 1488:10 1491:22 1492:11 1493:13 1494:5,15,16,19,21 1540:25 1541:18 1584:21

conspirator 1466:17 1472:24 1481:1,2,10

conspirators 1465:16, 24 1466:6 1471:23 1472:6,13 1473:15,19, 24 1488:2

conspire 1464:17

1470:25

constant 1528:11

constitute 1468:22 1481:15 1587:23

constituted 1540:19

constitutes 1468:9 1478:11 1493:8 1554:8

constituting 1479:2

constitution 1537:21 1556:22,23 1559:12,15

consult 1481:22

contact 1528:12

content 1460:15,17

contents 1456:14

contest 1543:18 1568:1

Continental 1524:6 1580:24,25

continue 1577:17

continued 1533:1

continuing 1491:13

continuously 1510:5

contract 1478:24 1491:6 1498:1 1524:3 1527:4,7,14 1529:11,18 1554:2,4,8 1579:16,23, 24,25 1580:8,9,12,13

contracts 1491:4,10 1498:2 1529:9,19,24 1579:18 1582:2

contractual 1584:11

contractually 1584:7

contradict 1453:8 1571:1

contradicts 1587:14

contrast 1536:15 1553:8

control 1456:8 1462:21 1478:19,21 1497:20,22 1542:16 1553:21 1554:1,8 1575:24 1587:7,9,10,13

controlled 1478:19 1497:20

controls 1478:18 1497:19 1553:19

convenience 1482:23

conversation 1525:2 1577:18

conversations 1506:7 1527:11 1529:21

convict 1465:20 1472:2 1566:6,21 1588:14

convinced 1457:15 1465:5 1466:22 1471:13 1480:7 1482:9

convincing 1455:17 1560:7

cooperated 1513:10

copies 1598:10,14

copy 1506:18 1537:24 1557:21 1596:21 1597:16,18,19 1598:15, 19

core 1522:24

Corporation 1470:3

correct 1517:24 1543:7,9 1547:5,6 1548:2,3,7,25 1567:8 1594:3 1597:20

correctly 1464:3

correctness 1454:13

corroborate 1512:13

costs 1525:7

counsel 1484:23 1497:15 1500:17 1508:14 1519:4 1522:8

counsel's 1586:20

count 1462:15 1464:10, 12,23 1470:19,20 1471:5 1473:2,21 1475:17,21 1476:12,16 1481:10,19 1482:24 1483:9,13,15,16,19,22, 25 1484:3,6,9,10,11,12 1486:10,13,18 1492:11, 15 1494:13,14,15

1495:22,23 1498:10,11 1499:13,14 1500:11 1501:2,6,16,21 1502:18 1546:8 1558:19

Index: connected..Cox

countless 1531:23

country 1540:6 1558:16 1569:8

counts 1474:9 1480:10 1481:7,13,15 1483:13 1486:14 1492:15 1493:13,15,16 1495:24 1498:6,7,8 1509:8 1533:5,7 1535:10 1541:25 1556:8 1557:14 1572:20

County 1547:1

couple 1507:23 1577:16 1578:21

court 1453:2 1454:19, 21 1459:20 1483:4 1484:22.24 1485:22 1509:11,13,14 1522:6,7 1535:16,18,19 1551:17 1556:10,12,13 1558:1 1569:3 1573:6 1576:5 1583:11 1584:25 1585:15,21 1586:10,18 1588:12 1589:3,6,15 1590:8,12,16,19,24 1591:4,7,13,20,25 1592:6,19,22 1593:4,7, 8,23 1594:1,5,8,14,18, 21,23,25 1595:3,5,9,13, 18,20,24 1596:2,7,13, 18,20 1597:1,16,19,21 1598:1,6,14,23,25 1599:4,9,11,13,16,18, 25

Court's 1587:20

courtroom 1482:21 1483:6 1586:9

cover 1526:3 1575:2

cover-up 1532:10

covered 1552:20 1553:14,15 1555:17

Covering 1505:7

COVID 1522:13

Cox 1555:21

CPA 1555:23 1566:12

crazy 1487:12 1493:5

created 1491:1 1523:24 1527:21

credibility 1457:24 1458:24 1460:21

credible 1511:24 1557:7

credit 1453:13 1500:4 1543:21 1544:17 1569:21

credits 1583:3

Creek 1580:1

crew 1530:2

crime 1460:5,8 1461:24 1462:14,21 1464:17,19 1465:1,5,8 1466:9,19, 22 1470:25 1471:2,8, 12,16 1472:17 1473:3 1474:14,17,24 1479:10, 17,18,19,20,22 1480:6, 25 1486:17 1487:5 1507:13 1515:4,21,23 1518:13,14 1521:13 1523:21 1532:15 1533:4 1539:1 1541:2, 20

crimes 1461:21 1462:4, 20 1581:19

criminal 1459:9 1463:16 1468:20 1470:12 1478:25 1480:13,15,18,19,21,23 1511:21,23,25 1512:1 1514:13 1538:3

criminalization 1533:19

criminally 1479:14

criminals 1513:17,20, 25

critical 1542:25

cross 1562:2

cross-examination

1506:14 1525:1,8,12 1544:14 1559:14,17,19, 21 1561:17,23 1562:15, 16,18 1565:24 1571:14 1588:6

Crossings 1579:25

crucible 1562:17

crunch 1582:22

CTMG 1547:2

current 1529:6 1535:4

cut 1554:19

D

daily 1540:9

Dale 1544:3

danger 1511:1

dark 1522:9 1531:19

date 1461:20,22,24 1483:2 1484:16 1498:12 1591:8

dated 1528:23

dates 1461:25

day 1500:22 1502:15 1512:20 1515:22 1521:3,11 1530:17 1556:18 1561:21 1576:1,7 1581:9 1583:1

days 1509:18 1543:4 1575:14

deal 1500:17 1507:1,3, 4,6 1580:3 1581:15,16

deals 1578:25

debenture 1477:11

debits 1583:3

deceive 1468:5 1470:12 1478:8 1493:3 1539:18,22 1588:2

December 1461:25 1502:3,4,6,16 1505:12 1531:13 1554:14,15,17 1575:12

decent 1522:3

decide 1453:21 1457:18 1458:4 1459:2 1462:2,11 1481:24 1482:15 1498:3 **decided** 1574:15

decision 1454:9 1455:19 1458:7 1459:4 1463:1 1464:22 1468:14 1471:5 1478:16 1482:4,6 1497:6 1498:3,4 1500:23,25 1501:1,15 1524:12 1526:15 1532:5 1560:10 1563:8 1566:3 1580:22 1583:15,16,20,23

decision-maker 1493:12

decisions 1533:18 1560:11,14 1563:23 1564:6

deductions 1456:25 1569:11

defendant 1454:24,25 1455:1,4,6,7 1457:16, 20 1459:9,12,14,22 1461:23 1462:4,5,8,10, 17,22,23 1463:16 1465:4,7,10,12,17,20, 21 1466:21,24 1467:4, 8,22,24 1468:23 1469:3,16 1470:11,13, 16,17 1471:11,12,15, 17,18,24 1472:2,3 1474:1,4,6 1477:6,8 1478:1,25 1479:1,9,11, 12,14,21,23,25 1480:3, 6,12,14,16,19,21,24 1481:6,9,12,14 1482:16 1483:15,19,22,25 1486:16,18,20 1487:9 1489:19 1490:11 1492:25 1496:1 1502:8 1514:4,7,10,12,14,15 1538:3,4,7,8,17 1541:3, 7,14,19 1558:19 1559:8 1570:25 1582:5 1590:2

defendant's 1515:2 1533:24 1538:23 1590:6

defendants 1453:12 1454:24 1458:3 1462:15 1464:11 1467:16,19 1470:20 1473:2 1474:10 1475:10,14,18 1476:1, 5,9,13,21 1477:1,3 1484:3,5 1487:25 1488:11,15 1489:4,6, 10,12,15 1490:25 1492:11,23 1494:14 1495:19 1496:8,12 1500:22 1502:5 1508:7, 23 1514:3 1515:8 1535:1 1537:10 1539:11 1541:25 1556:8 1572:20 1573:21,23 1574:1,10, 14,18 1575:7,19 1577:6 1581:23 1583:14,20,23 1584:1,17 1587:18

Index: CPA..defrauding

defendants' 1455:10, 13 1460:3 1521:24 1552:14 1581:20 1590:3,5,6 1591:4 1598:22

defense 1458:12 1497:14 1500:17 1506:20 1507:7,11 1508:14 1514:20 1542:6 1559:10 1576:4 1581:4,13,14,17,19 1582:15 1587:17,23 1588:1,2 1589:10 1590:2 1591:1,21 1596:23

defined 1480:2

definition 1492:14 1493:6,14,17 1497:12, 16 1553:21 1583:17 1587:8

definitions 1477:9 1492:14,16 1493:4 1497:9,10

defraud 1466:20,25 1467:2,9,14,25 1468:4, 11 1469:4 1470:4,12 1473:7 1474:2,11,19 1475:15,19 1476:14 1477:18 1478:3,7,13 1484:6 1488:12 1489:3 1490:12 1492:18 1493:2,10 1495:2,20 1496:2,13,18,19 1533:6 1539:16 1540:1 1541:8, 15 1542:2,8 1550:10,20 1583:21

defrauding 1469:20

degree 1468:20 destroying 1570:19 1471:4 1479:21 disobey 1468:19 1580:17 1493:20 1539:10 detail 1537:15 directing 1542:19 deliberate 1481:22 **dispute** 1496:4 details 1465:15,25 direction 1478:22 1586:5 1466:2 1469:1 1471:22 1479:5,6,8 1497:23 dispute's 1496:6 deliberately 1479:16 1472:7,10 1487:8,21 1542:17 1553:9 disregard 1454:11 deliberating 1485:15 determine 1453:11 directions 1553:6 1456:11,20 1464:8 1486:1 1561:4 1455:22 1458:20 1468:19 1493:20 **directly** 1458:18 1460:18 1539:10 1587:22 deliberation 1482:20 1465:25 1472:7 1478:17 1497:18 disregards 1529:13 determining 1454:8 deliberations 1453:8 1461:7 1463:6,12 distinction 1457:12 1454:6 1477:10 director 1523:6 1470:11 1494:1 1481:20 1482:7 1483:1, 1505:18 1576:20 1514:12 1538:2 3 1559:25 1586:4,8 **directors** 1491:15 distinctly 1503:24 developer 1517:25 **Delin** 1483:22 1503:15 1582:4 distribution 1499:2 developers 1507:2,6 delivery 1475:3,4 dirty 1534:16,19 1506:6,10 1507:5 1524:19 1578:8 1575:16 demand 1577:15 1581:15 disagrees 1533:18 distributions 1488:18, developers' 1506:15 demonstrate 1537:18 disbursement 1597:7 24,25 1489:6,8,17 1538:9 1543:14 1581:12 **disclose** 1570:16 1498:19 1500:1,14 1557:11 1592:4 development 1522:21 1501:9,19,22 1502:20 disclosed 1464:1 1505:4 1509:5 1518:20 1548:15 1568:14,15,20, demonstrated 1490:16 1503:21 1553:17 1588:7 1521:11 1523:25 1512:19 1545:21 1550:18 1553:16 developments demonstrates 1547:14 1548:17 1569:15 1573:15 1499:18 1501:4 1537:19 1551:10 disclosing 1501:18 1574:5,23 1578:3,8,17 demonstrating devise 1466:25 1469:4 1502:23 1581:10 1583:22 1584:13 1550:16 1488:12 1541:7 disclosure 1522:22 devised 1466:24 **District** 1463:23 denied 1520:16 1523:8 1548:13 1469:4 1488:11 1541:7 1573:22 document 1513:12 **deployed** 1511:17 differ 1458:18 1561:8 1528:20,23 1529:11 1512:16 disclosures 1508:5 1565:7 1568:16 1590:1 1522:23 1531:2 **Deposit** 1470:2 difference 1568:12,21, 1591:10 1592:2,6 1543:16 1546:12 1557:4 1566:17 depository 1470:1 documentation differences 1543:1 1573:23 1583:16 1499:8 1502:2 1530:12 deprive 1468:1 1478:4 1587:5 1592:8,9 1550:15 digital 1596:25 1597:1, 1492:19 1595:7,11 17,22,25 1598:11 **documents** 1489:25 depth 1536:4 discovered 1571:5 digitally 1598:5 1536:18 1544:5 1548:5 describe 1536:2 1550:8 1551:9 1552:10, discovery 1511:15 1553:25 1568:12 diligence 1517:2 18 1563:16,24 1564:2 1527:25 1528:8 1532:5 discredited 1460:9.22 1566:11 1570:11 describes 1498:9 1546:21 1547:8 1580:4 1586:2 1589:17.18 discretion 1529:19 1529:4 1590:3 1591:8,13,14 dime 1513:21,22 description 1597:14 discretionary 1554:3 1592:1,9,14,18 1593:10 dire 1557:19 1594:4,5,11 1595:16 descriptive 1507:20 discuss 1475:8 1596:20 1597:16 direct 1457:5,8,13,15 discussed 1466:11 **deserves** 1460:25 1478:21,22 1497:22,23 dog 1578:6 1472:19 1461:15 1505:14,18 1524:23 dollar 1494:9 1506:24 designed 1480:24 1525:5 1542:17 discussing 1587:8 1511:1.3.7 1530:20 1549:7 1552:12 1562:15 discussion 1462:13 1577:21 directed 1464:21

Index: degree..dollar

dollars 1517:11 door 1485:14 1486:1 1488:7 1573:15 1576:17 Dorney 1490:24 1526:5 Dorney's 1506:3 double-check 1598:12

double-checking

1590:18 1598:16 doubt 1455:6,8,11,12, 14,17 1457:16,20 1460:6 1461:23 1462:3 1465:6 1466:23 1467:12,13,22 1469:3, 14 1470:15 1471:14 1473:18 1474:1,3,6 1475:13 1476:4,23 1477:6 1479:22 1480:1, 8 1481:8 1482:17 1485:10,16 1486:3 1490:10 1494:3 1495:17 1507:8 1508:22 1514:7,8,11,13 1515:6,8 1521:24 1531:9 1532:14 1533:24 1535:7 1538:6, 24 1539:17 1540:23 1558:9,19,21 1559:5,9, 23,24 1560:2,6 1561:10,11 1563:11,19

Downey 1545:18 1546:3 1584:10

4,9

1564:12 1565:13

1567:17,18,23 1568:10,

24,25 1569:24 1570:22

1571:8,9,21,25 1572:1,

1566:7,8,24,25

draft 1579:23,24

drafted 1566:17

draw 1456:23 1457:2 1498:3 1502:11 1529:14,16 1530:1,20 1533:14 1575:5 1581:7

drawn 1455:3

draws 1526:11 1530:17 1573:19,20 1576:14 1578:5,12

drive 1549:7 1585:9,11,

23 1598:4

driving 1574:16 **dropped** 1580:8

drove 1518:6

dry 1500:15

DST 1490:4,5

due 1515:16,23 1517:2 1521:12 1522:13 1527:25 1528:8 1532:5 1546:21 1547:8 1563:11 1569:13 1575:13 1577:19 1580:4 1581:9

dug 1525:7 **duty** 1453:20,23 1454:9,15,17 1455:21 1459:10 1462:10 1481:21 1482:15

Ε

Eades 1546:21 1576:19

earlier 1455:21 1460:14,16,17,18,19 1489:1,9,17 1496:24 1497:3 1499:19,20 1500:1 1501:5,14 1509:5 1528:17 1533:15 1545:6 1573:15 1575:16 1583:22 1599:21

early 1488:15,20 1502:4 1587:1

easy 1521:25

economic 1523:17 1549:13,14

economics 1512:3

educated 1580:16

education 1461:9,16 1566:13

effect 1453:19 1482:11

effectively 1468:9 1478:12 1493:9

efficiently 1589:23

effort 1479:7 1481:22

Eggers 1459:17

1484:21,22,25 1528:17 1562:19 1572:22 1573:9 1583:14 1585:8

1586:12 1588:24

1589:8 1590:9,13,17,20 1591:6,15 1592:21,25

1593:6 1596:15,22 1597:2,24 1598:2,12,15

1599:2,15

election 1455:3

electronic 1585:6 1596:21

electronically 1585:14

element 1467:13 1476:24 1480:2,20 1490:11

elements 1464:19 1467:11 1471:2 1474:8 1475:13 1476:4 1486:2, 9,16,25 1488:8,10 1491:21 1494:16,20 1495:13,17 1496:7

email 1487:3,18 1491:12 1504:16 1520:9,13 1528:15 1530:6 1531:25 1532:2 1534:5,11,14 1570:15 1573:10 1575:3,4 1577:23,25 1582:7,18 1591:2,18 1594:16,25 1595:1,2,3,4,5

emailing 1502:5

emails 1490:7 1502:7 1504:11,21 1506:11 1520:10,11 1530:10 1531:22 1532:10,13,17, 18 1534:23 1539:13 1570:15 1573:4 1576:13 1577:7

embarrass 1566:20

employed 1467:2 1489:3 1535:2

employee 1511:19,20 1577:22

employees 1520:20 1531:20 1532:13 1535:3,4

encountered 1453:12

1555:2

end 1453:23 1488:6 1505:15 1515:15,20 1535:9 1554:12,13 1564:8 1567:25 1576:1 1581:8 1596:1

Index: dollars..error

ended 1506:7 1563:2

ending 1594:1,2

engage 1489:13 1508:6 1573:24 1583:20

engaged 1468:3 1478:6 1479:13 1480:24 1492:21 1494:21 1496:17,20 1584:17

engaging 1584:21

enhancements 1500:4 1543:21

1544:17

enjoy 1507:9

enjoys 1507:13

enlighting 1559:19

ensure 1578:4

enter 1462:12 1473:6,9 1474:1,4

entered 1465:24 1472:6 1473:15,19

entering 1473:4

enterprise 1479:7

entire 1510:1 1522:2 1555:9

entities 1507:22,23

entitled 1571:1

entity 1463:1 1468:14 1478:16 1499:19,20 1500:24 1501:5 1507:18 1553:24

entries 1551:10

environment 1507:8 1581:18

Ernst 1513:6,9

error 1507:14

4:21-cr-289-O **escape** 1456:6 essentially 1523:15 1529:10 establish 1466:12 1472:20 1479:21 established 1457:2 1479:1 1480:20 estate 1500:3 1543:21 1551:22 1566:14 1567:6 ethnic 1482:5 Etter 1502:12.15 1575:11 evaluate 1543:6 1561:12,20 evaluated 1458:24 event 1466:8 1472:16 events 1457:10 eventually 1506:22 1581:14 **evidence** 1453:21 1454:18,24 1455:2,16, 23 1456:1,8,15,22 1457:3,4,5,6,8,10,13, 15,21,22 1459:11,12, 15,23 1460:1,3,10,15 1461:7,17 1462:16,23

1463:25 1464:2,4,7,8

1481:25 1482:11

1487:25 1488:14

1491:16 1492:10

1496:22 1502:15

1505:14,21 1509:22,25

1510:14 1511:17,24

1512:1,5,10,11,13

1513:22 1514:5,18

1515:2,17 1519:10

1531:12 1533:2,8,23

1539:14,19 1540:24

1543:6,12 1545:16

1546:7,9 1547:20

1566:21 1569:10

1536:9,14 1537:4,12,18

1541:11,13 1542:16,20

1549:11 1550:16,21,22

1553:20 1555:5 1557:1,

7,10,15 1559:17 1560:3

1570:7,9,11,12,14,21

1521:9,23 1523:1

1538:9,17,20,23

1571:11,12,14 1572:15 1573:8 1575:1 1582:14 1583:8 1587:9,11,22 1588:3,19

ex-football 1561:24

exact 1461:22 1523:10 1558:10,12

examination 1524:23 1525:5 1534:4

Excel 1585:10,21

Exchange 1474:21 1475:6,23,24 1476:18

exclude 1455:12

exclusive 1460:23 1469:12

exclusively 1529:10, 16 1551:24 1552:4

excuse 1463:15 1500:19 1510:22 1511:18 1575:4

execute 1469:18 1474:10,18,25 1475:15 1476:6,10 1495:1,2,4,5, 20 1496:8 1542:1

executed 1475:14 1476:5,9 1491:4,10 1495:19 1496:8 1524:2 1527:14 1529:8 1542:6 1579:18

executing 1467:6 1474:10 1489:21

execution 1498:10

executives 1511:14 1513:14 1539:8 1545:14 1587:2

exercise 1531:25

exhibit 1453:6,8,11,14
1456:14 1491:8 1492:4
1500:8,18 1501:1
1502:14 1503:1,13
1504:22 1505:8
1507:15 1528:17
1529:3 1552:13 1577:9,
24 1579:5,17,21
1583:2,7 1584:5
1585:10,22 1589:8
1590:1,14 1591:4,15
1593:3 1596:16

exhibits 1455:25 1456:11,12,24 1464:1 1492:7 1502:1 1504:10 1552:14,16 1585:4,5,6, 9,12 1589:9,11 1591:1 1597:17 1598:4,8,11

exist 1546:7 1551:9 1594:10

existence 1463:5 1466:13 1472:21

exited 1586:9

expect 1454:22 1487:17 1497:14 1502:16 1506:14 1510:14 1511:13 1534:10

expected 1516:11 1547:22

experience 1456:25 1461:8,16 1532:8 1551:21

expert 1548:11,12 1551:17 1554:5 1566:8 1572:5,10

experts 1512:22 1548:18 1551:20

explain 1453:24 1454:5,10,16 1481:21 1593:17

explained 1454:19 1464:21 1471:3 1476:25 1486:22 1491:20 1494:22 1499:23 1534:14

explaining 1464:1 1592:9

explains 1591:11

exposed 1494:10

exposes 1470:5 1494:7

expressed 1461:2,11

extend 1542:14

extended 1518:13

extent 1453:6,7 1464:6

eyewitness 1457:9

F

Index: escape..false

facilities 1469:11,15, 21,23

fact 1457:9,11 1461:7 1462:19 1466:10 1468:10 1472:18 1478:13 1485:8 1493:10 1500:14,20 1501:17,23 1510:19 1521:19 1530:4 1548:18 1551:9

facts 1454:7,9 1455:22 1456:5 1457:2 1464:1 1468:21 1482:15 1523:19 1531:6 1558:3 1587:14

factually 1587:23 1588:10

fail 1537:20

failed 1460:12 1520:25 1533:4 1569:18

fails 1455:6 1514:9 1558:20

failure 1584:1

fair 1546:18 1548:22 1549:1 1556:20 1565:22,24 1566:2 1569:25 1572:17 1580:7

faith 1470:13,16 1514:17 1531:6,10,13 1533:9,10 1536:22,23 1537:22 1538:7,8,10 1540:17,21 1542:4 1545:9,15,25 1553:7 1561:2 1565:20

fall 1527:8 1532:19 1560:14 1568:18

false 1467:2 1468:6,8 1469:5,10 1473:11 1475:1 1476:7 1478:9, 11 1489:4 1493:5,6,8, 23 1495:6 1496:9 1498:17 1499:15 1500:12 1501:7 1502:22 1513:17 1520:6 1539:25 1542:8 1587:3

falsely 1460:10 falsity 1468:7 1478:10 1498:13 1501:3 1539:24 1540:2

familiar 1544:22

family 1560:13 1564:6 1566:23

father 1564:13

FBI 1510:23 1570:4,6 1583:1

feasibility 1527:9

February 1526:25 1582:25

federal 1470:2 1474:17,24 1485:22 1551:17 1572:7

feel 1456:24 1482:3 1485:17

fellow 1482:1,12

felt 1485:10,11 1519:21

female 1504:15

Ferguson 1551:8 1552:2,8 1577:4

fiduciary 1574:13

field 1554:5

fight 1578:15

figure 1488:10 1504:19 1507:17 1544:6 1579:9

figuring 1502:11

file 1474:22 1475:6,23 1476:19 1573:17 1574:25 1579:2

filed 1500:11 1501:21 1596:17

files 1489:18 1490:9 1544:5

filing 1495:24 1498:13, 14,17 1499:22 1502:24

filings 1490:13,19 1492:1 1496:24 1497:1 1502:19 1503:6 1508:3 1523:13 1531:3 1580:20 1581:2,23

1584:23

final 1453:3,9,16 1456:6,7 1528:23 1577:15 1588:18

finalize 1578:25

finally 1454:5 1502:18 1537:3 1562:25

finance 1575:6

financial 1464:11,13, 20 1467:15 1468:2 1470:1,4,5,6,8,10 1478:5 1484:7 1486:11 1490:6 1491:19,24 1492:12,20 1494:2,6,7, 11,12 1507:20 1515:11, 12,13 1525:23 1541:6, 15 1551:22 1552:3 1582:20 1584:20

financing 1521:10 1568:3 1574:6,9,11,19

find 1457:17 1462:19 1464:3,6 1465:4 1466:21 1467:10 1471:11,12 1476:21,22 1479:22,25 1480:1,6 1481:8,12 1483:15,18, 21,24 1484:3,4,5,6 1509:7 1523:20 1532:14 1533:6 1538:8 1583:18 1584:16,24 1589:19

finger 1559:2

finished 1553:1 1577:18

FINRA 1566:9 1578:15

firma 1518:4

five-year 1534:17

fix 1578:24

fix-it 1579:2

flashed 1487:4

flew 1519:20 1563:12, 20

flexibility 1532:20

flow 1527:20 1529:8 1586:17 1591:17

flowing 1550:4 1552:22 1553:6 focus 1509:25

focused 1551:22

folks 1504:16

follow 1453:24 1454:6, 10,14 1469:23 1529:22 1588:13,15

follow-up 1484:2

Fontanas 1580:4

forbid 1515:9

forbids 1468:18 1493:19 1539:9

Ford 1523:4 1524:10 1561:13 1562:2

Ford's 1506:6

forecast 1524:12 1527:16 1529:8

forecasts 1524:15

foregoing 1477:16

forensic 1500:19 1513:9 1576:11,24

foreperson 1482:20,23 1483:2,4 1593:9,19,25 1594:3,7,12,15,19,22, 24 1595:1,4,6,10,14,19, 21,25 1596:6

foreseeable 1481:5,11

foreseen 1469:25

form 1482:22 1483:10 1484:14 1491:22

formal 1454:23 1465:24 1472:6 1487:16

forms 1483:12

Forty 1552:1

forward 1505:25 1506:2 1530:8,24 1533:16 1537:18 1587:10

foul 1506:23

found 1459:21 1462:10 1475:10 1476:1 1481:6 1582:25

founded 1558:16

fourth 1467:8 1476:15 1480:16 1490:11

Index: falsely..fund

framework 1543:5

Francisco 1563:12

fraud 1464:10,13,18, 19,22 1465:8 1466:18 1469:13 1470:19,21 1471:1,5,16 1473:4 1474:9,15,25 1475:9,11 1476:2,22 1480:9 1486:11,18,24,25 1487:19 1488:8,11 1489:19 1490:1,11 1491:19,21,23 1492:12 1493:21 1494:6,15,17, 19,20,23 1495:13,14,17 1496:16 1506:21 1540:4,25 1541:1,2,6, 18,20,24 1542:6 1550:21 1551:22,23,25 1552:2,3 1554:23 1557:13 1570:3,25 1572:7,12 1580:16 1582:17 1583:5 1584:1, 2,19,22,23

fraudulent 1469:5,10 1473:11 1475:1 1476:7 1477:22 1495:7 1542:8

Friday 1580:16

friend 1502:12

friendly 1555:18

friends 1581:20,22

Friesenhahn 1526:21

Frisco 1529:25 1534:14 1546:23,24 1591:8,19 1592:22 1593:23 1597:7

front 1488:6 1505:15 1511:13 1512:17 1534:5

full 1515:14 1516:2,8

fully 1511:17 1512:16, 20 1536:19

function 1456:2

fund 1498:14,15 1499:19,20 1500:10,24 1523:23 1543:7,10 1578:4,7,12,19 1579:6

fundamental 1522:14 1523:16

funded 1499:17 1504:17

Funding 1548:15

funds 1470:9 1498:18 1500:13,15 1501:9,13 1508:3 1511:17 1512:15 1515:11 1543:25 1544:22 1546:13 1555:17 1594:17,19 1595:22

furtherance 1481:4,11

future 1475:3,4 1524:13,14,20 1526:14, 15,18 1527:19 1528:5, 21 1532:3,20,22 1533:12 1582:2

FYI 1578:24

G

gain 1468:2 1478:5 1492:20

game 1583:15

gave 1460:13 1485:1, 18,21 1487:12 1505:13, 20 1543:5 1555:1,12

general 1454:1 1459:15,23 1477:13 1538:18

generally 1486:15

generating 1512:16

generic 1498:15

gentlemen 1453:3 1484:25 1494:14 1504:9,24 1507:10 1508:9,13 1509:3,15 1510:3 1513:24 1518:15 1519:6 1520:5, 24 1521:22 1522:8 1535:20 1556:6 1572:22 1573:7 1575:17 1576:6 1577:7 1580:14,25 1581:13,19 1582:7 1583:12 1584:3, 16,25 1585:15 **Gilbert** 1580:8

Gilpatrick 1523:3 1525:3 1527:2,23 1528:7,14 1532:17,23 1570:16 1580:11

give 1453:4 1454:1,4, 11 1460:5,23 1461:14 1462:22 1482:10 1483:4 1485:7 1515:5 1533:24 1538:23 1552:13 1566:2,9 1588:20 1591:23 1593:15,16 1599:4

giving 1551:5 1599:11

glaring 1573:13

Glenn 1580:3

go-between 1575:22

good 1458:13 1459:12, 15,23 1460:7 1470:13, 16 1488:25 1507:1,3,4, 6,8 1508:20,21,24 1509:15 1514:17 1518:8,9 1520:1,9 1527:5 1531:6,9,13 1533:8,10 1535:20,21, 22 1536:22,23 1537:22 1538:7,8,10,11,13,18, 25 1540:17,21 1542:4 1545:9,15,24 1553:7 1555:24 1561:2 1563:21 1564:19,23 1565:20 1573:18 1576:18 1577:6 1578:16 1581:15,16,18, 21 1587:18 1599:16

good-faith 1514:14 1538:4

Goodman 1459:19 1522:5,8 1579:15,21 1585:20

goodness 1510:18 1559:21 1568:5

government 1455:5 1457:19 1458:12 1461:21,22 1462:2 1463:3 1465:5,23 1466:1,22 1467:10,12, 18,21 1468:25 1469:8 1471:13 1472:5,9 1473:14,25 1474:3,5 1476:23 1477:3,5,25 1480:7 1482:15 1485:9. 16 1487:16,20,22 1488:1 1493:22,24 1509:21,24 1511:8 1512:2 1513:10,16 1514:6 1515:7 1516:12 1518:16 1519:4 1520:5, 24 1522:3,14 1523:12, 15,19 1524:4,8 1526:8, 20 1529:7,9,13,15 1530:4,18,19 1531:14, 22 1533:4,17 1534:4,8, 22 1535:6 1537:16 1538:12 1539:6,16 1540:16,23 1542:13 1545:6 1546:4.5 1548:11,12 1554:16 1556:2 1558:8,18 1559:7,9 1560:21 1561:18 1566:20 1567:16 1569:14 1571:20 1572:9 1575:8 1583:2 1586:23 1587:12,15 1589:8,25 1590:22

government's 1455:9, 12 1491:8 1500:18 1501:1 1502:14 1503:1, 12 1504:10,22 1505:8 1507:14 1515:24 1521:14 1522:23 1523:8 1528:16 1533:9 1534:1 1536:11 1538:22 1548:18 1566:4 1577:8,24 1579:5,16,21 1583:7 1584:5 1587:9 1589:9, 25 1591:15 1593:3 1596:16 1598:19 1599:8

grace 1512:7 1575:14

grand 1513:20 1519:1

Grapevine 1563:21

great 1508:22 1520:22 1556:22 1571:18 1584:4,6

greedy 1574:21

Greenlaw 1458:22 1483:16 1493:1 1503:14 1513:19 1514:23 1520:16 1539:22 1572:18 1578:15 1582:5

Greenlaw's 1505:7

Index: fundamental..happy

groups 1497:8

guess 1592:10

guide 1482:20

guilt 1454:24 1455:7, 10,13 1457:16,19 1462:7 1478:25 1514:10 1521:24 1546:8 1559:3

quilty 1455:6 1457:17 1462:4,10,20 1465:4 1466:21 1470:18 1471:11,12 1472:25 1473:1,17,22 1475:11 1476:2,21 1480:1,6 1481:7,12,17 1482:16, 25 1483:17,20,23 1484:1,3,5 1492:11 1494:14,23 1506:24 1509:7 1514:7,16 1521:8 1522:1 1523:21 1531:11 1535:10 1538:8 1556:7 1558:19 1559:1,4,8 1561:2,5,9 1571:9 1572:18,19 1584:17,24

guy 1504:14 1577:1 guys 1556:19 1576:16

Н

Haan 1516:16

half 1468:9 1478:12 1493:9

hand 1485:18 1486:5

happen 1522:9 1562:10

happened 1454:8 1504:25 1511:6 1518:23 1519:18 1536:19 1574:17 1584:10 1586:21

happening 1505:1,2 1583:7

happy 1511:21

hard 1562:17 1565:5 1568:11 1571:8,9 1596:7,21 1597:16,18, 19 1598:10,14,15,19

harm 1506:23 1512:6, 11 1517:13 1541:11

Harry 1526:25 1532:6

hatched 1582:11

hear 1458:14 1511:18, 20 1512:15 1513:16,21 1555:6 1559:20 1585:1 1599:20

heard 1459:2 1461:1 1485:8 1487:25 1490:3 1491:16,25 1492:3,6,22 1497:6,11 1500:8 1503:17,18,20,25 1504:3,6 1507:22 1510:22 1513:7 1515:21 1519:17 1520:14,16,20 1522:22 1523:3 1524:6,8,9 1525:19 1526:4,5,8,20, 25 1527:13,17 1528:4, 11 1529:20,25 1530:10, 19 1531:20 1532:6 1533:8,9,14,25 1534:1, 8,22,23,25 1535:3,4 1537:7,8 1538:21 1539:19 1540:8 1561:19 1565:1 1580:1

hearing 1506:13 1557:18 1597:14

heart 1559:24

heartstrings 1508:16

heat 1576:21

Heather 1580:3

heavy 1455:9 1560:19, 22

Heck 1582:18

held 1479:14

helped 1490:8 1555:22

helpful 1456:3

helps 1592:15 1596:2

hesitate 1482:7

hesitating 1563:6

hesitation 1455:19 1560:8,9

Hey 1501:11 1504:16 1563:20

high 1520:23 1541:23

higher 1468:20 1547:25

highest 1561:6,7

highlighted 1494:24

hire 1513:2

historic 1529:6

hitting 1577:20

hold 1517:10 1574:8 1578:10

holders 1474:11

holds 1479:11

Hollis 1458:22 1483:15

home 1529:5 1560:12

homes 1568:2 1580:8

honed 1580:18

honest 1458:9 1482:10 1534:3,6,7,10,13 1555:8 1557:2

honesty 1459:24 1514:25 1518:7 1538:19

Honor 1459:17,18 1509:9 1522:4,5 1535:17 1573:5 1583:9 1585:8,19 1586:12,13, 14,22 1588:24,25 1589:8,12,16,20,22 1590:5,9,15,18 1591:12,15,23 1592:12 1593:1 1596:15,19 1597:6,24 1598:16,20 1599:7,17

honorable 1522:3

hope 1487:2,17 1535:21 1558:2

house 1569:20

Huge 1579:4

hundred 1511:1 1596:24

hurt 1582:8

hypothetical 1488:4 1520:6 1521:19

hypotheticals 1512:14 1553:15 1565:2

- 1

l's 1505:9

idea 1508:22,24

identified 1475:17,20 1476:11,15 1503:22 1589:11

identify 1539:20 1543:7 1579:5

identities 1465:16 1471:23

iffy 1595:11

ignores 1523:15 1553:16

II 1470:19,20 1471:5 1473:2,21 1481:7 1484:9,10 1486:13,14 1493:13,16 1494:15 1516:24 1547:12

III 1467:1 1473:8 1474:9 1475:16,20 1476:11,15 1480:10 1481:10,13,15 1484:11 1488:13 1489:5,9 1490:15,20 1493:15 1495:21 1496:11,19 1498:8,11, 14,16 1499:11,25 1500:12 1501:7,13,20 1502:20 1503:9 1504:1, 4,20 1506:1 1508:1,3,7 1509:1 1516:13,20,24 1518:20 1524:1 1536:7 1541:9,25 1542:11 1543:2,8 1546:16,18 1547:12,18,20,25 1548:6 1549:3 1550:4, 18 1552:22 1553:3,5 1555:16 1568:3 1569:15 1575:10,15 1578:11,13,23 1581:10

III's 1489:10 1502:24 1505:10,11,12 1507:4 1574:5

illegal 1491:17

Index: hard..income

imminent 1511:2

impact 1516:2

impacts 1528:20

impairment 1528:18, 23

impaneled 1537:8

impartial 1455:15 1481:25

import 1562:12

importance 1463:5

important 1455:19 1458:1,6 1509:18 1510:6 1534:21 1537:9, 23 1556:18 1557:17 1558:1,2,15 1560:5,10, 11 1563:8,9 1564:6 1565:11 1566:22 1567:22

imposes 1459:9 1561:25

impossible 1560:18 1571:10

impress 1458:8

impression 1579:18

improbable 1460:6 1538:25

improper 1512:12 1531:21 1588:3,11

impugning 1588:1

inaccurate 1587:24 1588:11

inappropriate 1526:24 1534:18 1549:8

include 1493:15 1529:8 1591:18

included 1490:4,5 1493:4 1532:21

including 1455:24 1458:3 1463:23 1572:5, 10 1590:20 1592:25 1593:2

income 1512:17

inconsistent 1460:3. 12.19 1515:3 inconvenient 1512:4 1520:4 increased 1470:6 1494:7,11 independent 1492:9 1516:8 1534:25 indicating 1457:11 indicted 1568:18 indictment 1454:23 1461:19 1462:1.4.6.15 1464:12 1465:9 1466:3 1467:16,20 1469:1,7 1470:20 1471:17 1472:10 1473:2 1475:17,21 1476:12,16, 25 1477:4,19 1480:10 1481:19 1482:25 1483:9,13,16,20,23 1484:1 1496:12 1498:8 1507:16,17,19 1526:17, 18 1570:20 1586:24 indifference 1468:7 1478:10 indirect 1478:22 1497:23 indirectly 1478:18 1497:19 individual 1462:3 1527:23 1539:7 individually 1457:20 1462:18 1482:16 individuals 1536:20 1538:10,22 1541:11 1574:4 **industry** 1534:10 inference 1455:3 **inferences** 1456:5,23 inflammatory 1510:17 **influence** 1462:25 1468:13 1478:15 1482:3,6 influenced 1508:10 influencing 1463:1

1468:13 1478:15

1493:12 information 1498:18 1499:16 1500:13 1501:7,8 1502:21,22 1507:20 1553:11 1555:13,15 1566:10 1598:21 informed 1491:4 initial 1586:20 1587:21 **initially** 1598:3 innocence 1455:2 1514:5 1537:7 1571:15 innocent 1454:25 1537:11,12 1558:5,6,14 inside 1488:5 1590:1 insinuation 1534:15 **instance** 1498:11 1499:23 1592:20

institution 1464:11,13, 20 1467:15 1470:1,2,5, 6,9,10 1484:7 1486:12 1491:20,24 1492:12 1494:2,6,7,11,12 1515:11,12 1541:6,16 institutions 1490:6

1507:21 1515:14 1584:20 instruct 1514:1

1588:18

instructed 1462:9 1485:24 1531:7 1533:21 1588:12,15

instruction 1453:4 1454:12 1485:7,12,19, 20,23 1531:5,8 1537:23 1538:1,15 1557:20 1587:20 1588:16,20

instructions 1454:1,2 1456:19 1462:24 1464:22 1468:16 1471:4 1480:2 1485:1 1486:10 1505:13,19 1506:17,19,23 1507:12 1508:17 1536:22 1537:24,25 1538:16 1539:4 1558:11 1559:25 1560:19 1561:11 1572:16 1588:13 instructive 1586:23

instrument 1477:13 insufficient 1549:19

Insurance 1470:2

insured 1470:2

integrity 1459:25 1514:25 1518:7,8,10 1520:23 1538:19

intend 1541:7

intended 1466:25 1468:1 1469:4,11 1478:4 1488:11 1492:19,20 1515:9 1580:19

intent 1453:13 1465:13 1467:9 1468:4,5,10,18 1470:12 1471:19 1475:18 1476:13 1478:7,8,13 1479:10,17 1480:4,19 1490:12 1493:2,3,10,19 1496:1, 13 1514:13 1515:8 1531:12 1532:15 1533:3,4,5,6,7 1536:20 1538:3 1539:8,16,18,22 1540:1 1541:4,14 1542:2,3,4,8 1557:8,9, 12 1575:1 1579:23,24 1580:5,14 1582:14

intent-driven 1539:4

intentionally 1463:18 1465:18 1471:25 1487:10 1512:12 1539:10

interaction 1570:6

interest 1458:10 1477:11,14 1507:3 1512:6 1518:12 1527:11 1548:1 1581:16

interesting 1557:22

interests 1466:12 1472:20

interim 1477:15

intermediaries 1478:18 1497:19 internal 1531:15 1533:18

Index: inconsistent..investors

internally 1592:7

interpret 1555:3 1593:11

interpretation 1456:8

interrupting 1586:17

interstate 1463:20 1466:19 1467:5 1469:11,15,17,21 1489:20 1490:1

interviewed 1563:22

introduce 1591:21

introduced 1519:22 introductory 1587:2

invest 1503:11

invested 1505:5 1512:18 1574:4

investigating 1582:16 1583:4

investigation 1513:10 1531:16 1534:24 1536:11,12,16 1549:9 1551:23,25 1552:4,8 1553:10

investigations 1552:3 1554:23

investigator 1551:22

investing 1466:25 1488:12 1497:4 1499:11 1500:7 1501:11 1503:8 1541:8 1583:24

investment 1499:23 1520:2 1546:22 1564:18,22

investments 1500:3 1543:21 1548:14

investor 1505:4 1511:14 1547:10 1564:17,18,19,21,22 1574:22 1578:3

investors 1489:1,2,5,7, 9,10,13,16,18 1498:16 1500:1,10,16 1501:25 1502:21,24 1503:2

1504:1 1507:5 1508:25 1509:4,5 1511:14 1512:10,21 1516:10,11, 20 1517:5,12 1518:19 1520:1 1522:24 1531:4 1541:12 1548:23 1550:5,10,18 1552:23 1572:2 1573:15,23 1574:13 1575:16 1578:8 1581:24 1582:12 1583:22,23

investors' 1490:5,6 1501:14 1505:7 1509:2 1574:6,11 1576:10 1583:21

invoice 1577:10

invoices 1530:22

involved 1460:4 1487:13 1493:14 1515:4 1522:20 1526:22 1531:2,3 1549:3,4 1567:6 1576:25 1580:15

involvement 1492:24

involving 1461:3 1477:23 1547:21

issue 1461:7 1489:8,16 1504:19 1532:20 1540:3 1550:25 1572:2 1581:1 1587:7 1595:6,7

issuer 1474:20,21 1475:5,21 1476:16 1478:20 1497:21

issues 1456:19 1568:19

IV 1467:1 1473:8 1484:11 1488:13 1490:14,18 1495:21 1499:13,14,25 1500:16, 20 1503:6 1504:7 1506:1 1507:3 1508:1, 2,3,7,25 1516:20,24 1536:7 1541:9 1542:11 1543:2,8 1546:16,18 1547:12,18,21,25 1548:6,13 1549:2 1550:5,9 1552:19,23 1553:5 1568:3 1571:22, 23 1575:15 1578:12 1579:6,11 1581:17 1584:15 1593:24

1594:20

IV's 1489:7 1505:10 1574:5,11

IV-TO-III 1588:8

J

James 1490:24 1506:3 1526:5

January 1461:24 1488:15,20

Jeff 1519:16 1522:12 1523:3 1525:3 1527:2, 23 1528:6,14 1532:17, 23 1534:8 1555:11 1565:14 1570:16

Jeffrey 1483:25

Jester 1458:22 1483:25 1522:10,17,20 1523:1, 15,20 1528:4 1531:1,9, 18,20,23 1532:15,16 1533:3,17 1534:3,9,13, 16 1535:4,8,11 1539:23 1562:19 1572:19 1578:19,24 1582:5

Jester's 1531:12 1533:8,25

jilted 1511:14

job 1457:18 1458:1 1459:1 1507:13 1511:22 1530:7 1534:20

jobs 1510:4 1511:22 1522:1 1527:6 1532:13

join 1464:25 1471:7

joined 1465:12 1471:18 1486:20

joins 1465:18 1471:25 1479:9 1487:10

joint 1479:7 1590:14

Jones 1487:12

journal 1551:10 1593:20

judge 1454:3 1461:13 1485:1,12,18,20,24 1486:6,8,22 1491:20 1492:13,22 1494:22 1497:11,17 1505:13,20 1506:17 1514:1,2,20 1515:1,9 1531:7 1533:21 1557:18 1558:2,3,4,10,23 1559:6,10 1560:17 1561:11,25 1562:22 1569:1,2,5,10 1571:10 1583:17 1599:23

Judge's 1572:15

judges 1453:19 1454:7 1457:24 1482:14

judgment 1458:2 1545:7,16 1561:21

June 1491:11 1527:5

juror 1484:15,16

jurors 1454:7,21 1482:1,12 1557:1,6 1558:20 1559:10 1560:4,16,23 1561:3 1562:6,12 1564:5 1565:12 1566:8,24 1567:17,24 1568:10,24 1569:24 1570:22 1571:8,19 1572:13 1586:9 1587:22 1593:19 1594:12

iury 1453:17,18,20 1461:6 1482:18,24 1483:8,15,18,21,24 1484:16 1485:3.22 1486:10 1506:17,23 1507:12 1508:17 1509:16 1510:3 1513:20 1519:1 1522:9 1526:17 1531:5 1536:22 1537:24 1549:10 1558:3,24 1568:13 1569:7,8 1573:11 1585:2,3,4 1586:15 1588:2,7,12,18 1592:11 1593:7 1596:12 1598:21

just-in-time 1521:9 1574:9,10,19

Justice 1485:6 justified 1456:24 Κ

Index: investors'..knowledge

Kahane 1491:16,17 1503:16,17,19,20,25 1518:16 1576:20 1582:4

Kearney 1564:9

Kesler 1534:8

Kevin 1546:21

kids 1566:23

kind 1465:1 1471:8 1497:15 1503:10 1590:21 1595:10,12 1596:23

Kitchen 1551:1,21 1554:22

Kitchens 1540:8 1542:21 1544:3,15 1552:9,21 1553:20 1577:2 1587:11

knew 1463:10 1465:10 1471:17 1486:18 1488:25 1503:10 1509:24 1517:2,12 1519:19 1528:7,10 1532:25 1541:22 1547:14 1548:9,10,17 1561:24 1562:6 1568:5, 17,19 1576:24 1581:22 1582:3,7,9,13 1587:15 1588:9

Knight 1513:7

knowing 1465:15 1468:5 1471:22 1478:7 1479:24 1487:8 1493:3 1539:18,21 1565:8

knowingly 1463:17 1465:18 1466:24 1468:21 1469:4 1471:25 1473:4,7,10, 15,19 1474:10,17,24 1475:14 1476:5 1488:11 1495:1,4,19 1496:8 1541:7 1542:1,6

knowledge 1457:9 1461:4,6,8 1466:9,14 1468:21,23 1469:22 1472:17,22 1479:20 1480:21 1533:11

		,	
1539:12	law-abiding 1459:25	level 1523:2 1530:17	1500:2,10 1501:4,5,18 1502:21,22 1506:1,15
	Lawlis 1545:22,23 1555:11 1565:14	Lewis 1537:14 1556:11,12,14 1569:4	1502:21,22 1506:1,15 1512:21 1515:14 1516:17 1517:22
	laws 1559:12	1589:1	1523:17,24 1524:1,24
lack 1502:21 1511:15	Lawson 1563:12	liability 1577:21	1525:4 1533:15
lacking 1541:10	1576:20	lie 1557:12 1576:12,13	1543:20 1544:16,17 1546:10,17 1547:15,20
ladies 1453:3 1484:25 1494:13 1504:9,24	lawyer 1562:22	lied 1498:25 1573:25	1548:14,24 1553:3,5
1507:10 1508:9,13	lawyers 1456:1,2,9	lien 1594:7,8	1575:15 1576:15 1578:20 1581:12
1509:3,15 1510:3 1513:24 1518:15	1493:5 1588:2	liens 1575:20	log 1598:3
1519:6 1520:5,24	lay 1474:8 1536:1	life 1508:21	LOI 1527:1,3,15
1521:22 1522:8	layout 1590:21	light 1456:24 1522:10	LOIS 1527:2,10
1535:20 1556:6 1572:22 1573:7	lead 1457:1 1569:12	1531:19	
1575:17 1576:6 1577:7	learned 1524:14	lights 1578:9	long 1461:22 1509:16, 18 1514:24 1563:14
1578:1 1580:14,24 1581:13,18 1582:7	1526:6	Likewise 1466:1	1568:6,7
1583:12 1584:3,16,25	leave 1571:16,17 1586:6 1599:21	1472:9	longer 1484:18
1585:15		Linda 1530:10	1589:18
Lady 1485:6	led 1491:9 1580:13	list 1590:14 1598:8	looked 1517:6 1526:14
laid 1580:11	ledger 1597:7	listed 1507:24	1544:5 1546:5 1548:18 1549:22,23 1550:7
land 1517:24 1523:11	ledgers 1582:19	listen 1508:13 1561:17,	1552:10 1561:20
1524:18 1530:3,9,24	Lee 1483:19	18 1562:14	1567:14
1546:24,25 1547:1 1568:13,14,19,20,22	left 1518:11,16 1556:25	listening 1556:16	lose 1506:24
1581:5	Legacy 1489:11	live 1583:15	loss 1470:6,7 1494:8,
language 1554:4	1491:25 1492:6 1498:19 1499:1,5	lives 1522:2,3	11,13 1562:23 1563:1
laptop 1597:24	1501:8,23 1505:10,12	living 1522:2 1570:10	lost 1494:8 1570:24
large 1597:5	legal 1470:14,17	loan 1489:12 1497:2	lot 1485:8 1491:5 1507:9,20,23 1517:2
large-scale 1584:17	1514:15 1531:10	1498:19,20 1499:1	1520:9 1529:12,14,25
Las 1580:3	1538:5	1500:15 1501:12,13 1504:4,7 1505:9,10,11,	1530:16 1556:19
late 1484:19 1492:6,8	legally 1456:15 1587:23	12 1507:2 1516:4,5,6	1576:23 1581:6
1512:6,8 1518:12	legitimate 1536:16	1525:23 1528:18,22 1529:4,25 1530:1,3	lots 1529:9 1553:1
law 1453:24 1454:4,10,	1552:8 1572:6,12	1531:25 1533:10	love 1511:22 1557:18 1561:16 1569:7
15,18,25 1455:1	1574:19 1579:12	1543:22,23 1544:5,20,	Loved 1555:25
1456:20 1457:12,14 1459:9 1468:18,19,24	legitimately 1521:17	21 1546:23 1548:1,5 1552:23,24 1553:2,24	
1479:3,11 1480:5	lender 1567:4 1575:4	1562:3,13 1563:2,5	Lunch 1586:5
1486:9 1487:7 1493:19,	1581:6,8	1568:14,22,23 1569:19 1575:5 1581:7 1592:4,	Lyons 1487:13
20 1506:18 1514:4 1515:9 1536:2 1537:6,	lenders 1523:9 1524:3,	17 1593:21 1594:17	
11,20 1539:9,10,12	4,18 1530:13 1580:23	1595:16,19,23	
1540:3,4,6,11,12 1541:21 1542:23	lending 1554:2	loaned 1574:21	M/i 1580:8
1556:22 1557:9,12,17,	length 1552:21	loaning 1499:24	mad 1502:3 1504:18
23 1558:2,6,21 1561:5,	letter 1525:4,6,7,9,10	loans 1489:8,17 1498:3	1515:15,16 1516:3
6,17 1569:7 1576:5 1580:17	1526:2 1579:23,24 1580:4	1499:16,17,18,19,20,25	1518:11,13 1520:13 1570:11

Index: lack..mad

made 1454:20 1456:1 1463:10 1468:7,10 1478:9,13 1488:23 1493:10 1494:3 1495:6 1497:5 1498:3,4 1499:7,17 1500:17,23, 25 1501:1,4,15 1506:14 1524:1 1526:15 1533:18 1540:1 1547:25 1550:3 1559:4 1564:19,22 1580:21 1583:20,23

maintained 1520:19

make 1456:25 1459:4 1480:17 1491:1 1492:16 1497:2 1499:6 1500:2 1502:16 1515:19,21 1524:17 1527:8 1530:14 1543:20 1561:21 1563:8,23 1569:11,12 1573:18,19 1574:22 1575:16 1582:2 1592:13 1598:12

makes 1457:12 1464:16 1466:19 1470:24 1474:17,24 1510:17 1524:20 1569:6,7

making 1455:19 1458:2,7 1459:3 1516:17 1523:25 1524:14 1560:9 1564:5 1574:16 1577:7 1583:3

man 1505:24 1514:24 1534:6,7 1553:24 1567:2,20 1570:11 1578:17,18

management 1478:23 1497:24 1523:6 1542:17,19 1547:2

manager 1523:2,5 1528:6 1532:13

managers 1528:11 1533:11

manipulated 1491:3, 11,14

manner 1460:23

March 1491:3,9 1528:18,24

margin 1505:7

market 1527:7 1529:5, 6 1587:3 1592:22

markets 1520:17

Marriage 1560:13

marshal 1536:8 1537:12

marshaling 1543:12

martial 1549:11

Martinez 1500:19 1504:25 1510:22,23 1512:3 1536:13 1548:21 1549:6 1551:14,16 1564:4 1567:3 1572:5,10 1576:25

Martinez's 1550:14 1553:8 1572:5,11

massive 1534:23

match 1583:3

material 1462:25 1463:4,8 1467:3 1468:10,12 1469:9 1478:12,14 1489:4 1493:9,11 1496:9

materiality 1463:3,12

materially 1473:11 1476:7 1582:23

math 1534:17 1576:4

Matt 1506:4 1528:14,25

matter 1506:21 1575:20,21

matters 1461:3,10 1556:19 1571:11,12

Matzinger 1579:23

Mccormick 1513:7 1531:15 1534:23 1577:3

means 1463:17,20 1467:25 1468:4,16 1469:5,12 1470:1 1473:10 1475:1 1476:7 1477:10,18,22 1478:3, 7,17,21 1480:18,23 1492:18 1493:2 1495:6 1496:9 1497:18,22 1539:7 1542:7 1545:24 1560:23 1595:16,25

meant 1532:17

measured 1554:11,13,

meet 1520:25 1531:14 1537:19

meeting 1506:4

meetings 1528:12 1529:22

meets 1558:8

Megatel 1580:3

Mehrdad 1573:18 1575:23

Melissa 1599:18

member 1465:2,3,14 1471:9,10,21 1481:3,9 1487:7 1503:15

members 1453:18 1466:5 1472:12 1487:24 1555:14

memory 1458:13 1562:23 1563:1

men 1503:2 1549:10 1568:12 1576:9 1580:10 1582:9

mentioned 1493:25 1498:6 1528:17 1537:22

mentor 1555:25

mentored 1555:22

mere 1466:8,9 1470:8 1472:16,17 1479:19 1482:12 1515:10

message 1483:4,6

met 1488:9 1563:21

method 1576:11

methodology 1549:2

Metro 1591:2

Michael 1546:15

1555:6

middle 1523:24 1554:25 1569:20 **million** 1490:21 1511:1 1526:11 1530:20 1546:23 1550:1 1575:12 1577:3 1579:6,

Index: made..modeling

million- 1510:25

8 1584:6

millions 1520:11,12

mind 1459:3,8 1482:8 1483:7 1532:23 1539:5 1564:19

minor 1465:22 1472:4

minute 1559:18 1562:7 1565:1,3 1589:2

minutes 1485:1 1569:3 1589:1

mirrors 1537:1 1553:13

misappropriated 1512:2 1513:21

misappropriation

1570:7 mischaracterizes

1583:10

misleading 1498:18 1499:16 1500:12 1501:7 1559:21,22

misled 1512:5,10

misreads 1529:9

misrepresentations 1489:4

missing 1570:5

mistake 1463:18 1550:3,12

mistaken 1593:22

misunderstanding 1522:15,18

mix 1596:21

Moayedi 1553:25 1573:18 1575:24

model 1524:12 1551:15,16 1574:20

modeling 1524:2 1528:5 1532:3 1533:10

INITED STATES vs HO:21-cr-289-O

models 1524:16

moment 1557:25
1559:22 1585:1
1590:15

Monday 1521:18
1578:14

money 1468:1 1473:12
1474:4 1475:2 1476:6
1478:4 1488:16,19
1489:1,7,11,16 1490:5,
6,18,20 1492:19,23
1495:8 1496:9,21
1497:2 1499:2,8,10,24
1500:9,20,23 1501:11,
14,23 1502:12,13,17,23

1503:4,13 1504:1,3,6, 20 1505:3,7 1508:6,25 1509:1,2,4 1510:7,8,11 1511:14 1512:2 1515:20,22 1516:14,20 1518:19 1521:2,5,10 1534:16 1542:7 1547:24 1549:15,19 1550:4,9,17 1569:15 1570:8,23,24,25 1574:5,6,11 1575:10,15 1576:1,3,8,10,12 1577:7 1578:20 1579:11,13 1581:9 1583:19,22 1584:9,13

month 1502:9 1515:15, 20 1573:14 1578:9 1581:8 1584:18

months' 1577:5

moral 1520:22

morning 1453:7 1509:15 1521:18 1528:17 1535:14,20,22 1537:9,13,18 1543:14 1578:14

Morrison 1483:16

mother 1576:22

motive 1492:25 1493:1 1534:19

Motors 1524:11

move 1505:25 1530:8

1533:15

moved 1508:3,6

movement 1549:15

moving 1530:24 1550:9

Mueller 1579:10

multi-hundred 1510:25

multiple 1501:10

Murphy 1516:23 1517:3 1547:11

mushy 1497:15

muster 1461:12

Ν

naivety 1463:13,14

named 1467:19 1477:4 1507:23

names 1498:16,24

narrative 1520:6

narrowly 1593:14

national 1482:5

natural 1462:25 1468:12 1478:14 1493:11

nature 1465:17 1469:2 1471:24 1487:9

Navigant 1491:12,13

Neal 1535:23

necessarily 1466:12 1472:20

needed 1497:7 1506:7, 10 1519:21 1531:17 1555:15 1576:25 1581:9 1583:18

negative 1516:2 1556:3

neglected 1453:4

negligence 1463:13,15

nice 1508:15 1514:20 1520:20 1567:2,20

night 1555:23

nomenclature

1498:21

nonexistence 1463:6

nonsense 1516:3 1519:10

Nor-tex 1580:4

note 1461:19 1477:10 1584:11 1585:24 1592:11 1593:11 1596:3 1598:7,9

notebooks 1552:14

notice 1456:6 1494:16

notifying 1506:5

notion 1510:6

notions 1454:14

nots 1500:6

November 1501:21 1525:22

number 1482:19 1489:3,19 1490:3 1492:13 1496:1,2 1497:9 1499:2 1527:13 1528:22 1587:5,6

numbers 1507:21 1552:13 1582:22 1583:4 1589:24

numerically 1483:8

numerous 1528:11

0

O'CONNOR 1485:1, 13,18,20,24 1486:6,8, 22 1491:20 1492:13,22 1494:22 1497:12,17 1505:13,20 1506:17 1533:21 1558:10,23 1583:17

Oaks 1580:7

oath 1454:20

Obert 1458:22 1483:22 1535:24 1537:4 1539:21 1544:13,15,16 1547:24 1548:4 1555:5, 9,21 1556:1,4 1572:19

object 1573:5 1583:9 1587:24 1588:4,17

objection 1586:19,22 1588:21 1590:22

Index: models..omissions

objections 1455:25 1456:10 1509:9 1588:22

objective 1473:23 1545:8 1553:10

objectives 1466:7 1472:15 1473:5,16,20 1499:24

obligated 1539:17 1584:7

obligation 1574:14 1584:11

obtain 1473:10 1474:4 1476:6 1495:6 1496:21 1542:7

obtained 1496:9 1499:18 1501:4

occasion 1465:19 1472:1 1487:11

occasions 1503:4,12

occur 1503:19

occurred 1464:8 1477:23

occurring 1588:9

October 1505:23 1525:22 1582:10

offense 1462:5 1464:13,18 1467:17 1468:22 1470:21 1471:1 1474:12,17 1477:1 1479:2 1480:2,9 1481:3,4,15

offenses 1461:20 1481:1,10,13

offer 1579:25 1580:6

offered 1453:9 1459:12,14,22,23 1538:17

offering 1511:24

officer 1483:5

offices 1513:13

omissions 1586:25

4:21-cr-289-O omits 1468:9 1478:12 1493:9 one's 1578:16 1579:3 one-sided 1562:15 open 1497:7 1550:19 1551:7 1557:2 opening 1509:20 1510:14 1524:10 1529:18 1536:1,6 1542:25 1543:4,11,16 1547:19 1557:1 openly 1531:18 1571:3 **operated** 1522:10 1524:5,6,15 1531:18 1536:21,23 **operates** 1522:15 1531:1 operating 1510:4

operating 1510:4 1521:11 1540:21 1550:11 1561:2 1571:3

operation 1554:14

operational 1522:20, 21 1523:14 1531:1 1532:12

operations 1489:6 1523:2 1525:15 1554:10,11,19,24

opinion 1456:18 1459:13,15,22,23 1461:9,12,13,17 1482:12 1519:11 1538:18

opinions 1454:14 1461:2 1482:8 1497:16 1566:2

opportunities 1501:10

opportunity 1458:16

opposed 1587:3

opposite 1513:24 1525:14

option 1475:4

order 1470:7 1473:22 1488:18 1505:4 1523:20 1586:21

orderly 1525:13,16

ordinarily 1460:4 1479:3 1515:3

ordinary 1469:24

organizational 1507:21

origin 1482:6

original 1509:20 1553:3

originate 1544:16 1546:17

originated 1499:16

origination 1525:24

outcome 1458:11

overextended 1574:21

overhead 1525:7 1526:6,11

overrule 1588:22

Overruled 1573:6 1583:11

owed 1574:13

ownership 1478:24 1497:25

Ρ

p.m. 1600:2

pages 1499:21 1504:11 1585:11,23 1596:24 1597:3,9 1598:18

paid 1489:8,17 1501:18,24 1502:5 1506:16,22 1512:6 1515:14 1516:2,8 1526:6,10 1533:15 1534:16 1550:17 1577:9,11,17 1581:12, 14 1592:4,17 1595:16,

paper 1504:19 1513:13 1519:13 1574:25 1575:2 1597:3

papered 1573:17 **paperwork** 1530:14

paragraph 1494:24

Park 1580:5

Parker 1528:15 1532:21

Parker's 1506:4 1528:25

part 1458:1,5 1463:16 1465:22 1472:4 1494:25 1497:10 1562:18 1569:21

participant 1479:23

participate 1479:17 1480:23 1500:3 1543:20,23,25 1544:17, 21

participated 1465:21 1472:3 1480:4,15 1481:14 1533:14

participating 1544:10

participation 1477:12, 14 1490:17 1575:3

participations 1490:14 1496:25

parties 1453:6 1454:22 1503:22

parties' 1585:9 1598:4

partner 1545:23 1546:15 1547:23 1555:6,16

partners 1555:17

partnership 1465:1 1471:8

party 1542:14

party's 1590:13

password 1598:3

past 1508:20 1522:12, 16 1575:13 1577:19

path 1505:25 1506:2

patience 1572:13

pattern 1467:25 1478:3 1492:18

Paul 1574:25

Paul's 1583:19

pay 1488:24 1489:1,6, 11 1490:20 1498:19 1499:19,25 1500:13 1501:9,13,14 1502:13, 17,20,24 1503:9 1504:1,4 1505:4 1509:5 1518:20 1521:11 1524:24 1525:6,14 1526:2 1547:25 1553:2, 16 1569:15 1574:11,25 1575:12,15 1578:3,7,22 1581:7 1583:19,22 1584:6,7,12

Index: omits..people

pay-down 1530:3

paying 1505:9,10,11,12 1509:1 1526:12 1527:6 1531:24 1569:20 1584:9,12

payment 1490:21 1502:16 1575:13 1577:15

payment's 1518:12

payments 1492:6,8,9 1497:2 1499:6 1512:6 1518:12 1523:11 1581:5

payoff 1589:17 1593:20 1594:4,5

payroll 1515:21,23 1521:12 1549:17

PDFS 1597:5.8

Pelletier 1509:13,15 1541:16 1549:17 1553:15 1584:8 1585:17,18 1599:23

Penn 1527:19 1528:18 1545:23 1547:23 1555:19 1565:18 1566:4 1571:22 1579:17 1580:13 1582:3

people 1485:8 1497:15 1503:2 1507:9 1510:17 1513:14 1518:8 1519:7, 8,12,13 1520:10,21,22 1521:8,17 1522:1 1523:3 1538:13 1545:8 1547:14 1556:18 1557:8 1561:8 1563:21 1566:2 1571:6 1580:15,

16.17 1583:19 **presumed** 1454:25 phrase 1477:17 poor 1489:23 1578:8 1537:11 1558:5.6.13 performed 1516:6,11 physically 1586:2 portfolio 1529:5 presumption 1537:7 1530:17 **performs** 1479:10 picked 1549:6 1583:14 portfolios 1528:5 presumptions period 1499:15 1512:7 picking 1558:24 1557:16 1527:9 1534:17 1551:4 **portion** 1553:2 piece 1513:13 1519:13 1554:11,13,25 1575:14 pretending 1529:15 1570:14 **position** 1548:19 permissible 1508:4 pretenses 1469:5 **pinpoint** 1598:8 possession 1463:21, 1473:11 1475:1 1476:8 permitted 1456:13,22 22 1478:21 1497:22 pitch 1490:23 1505:23, 1495:7 1496:10 1542:8 1485:22 possibility 1532:3 24 1582:6 pretty 1579:3 1590:23 person 1458:5,8 1597:4 place 1502:25 1504:23 possibly 1564:12 1460:7 1462:7 1463:1, 1597:15 1598:18 1568:16 5.9 1465:8 1466:14 previously 1476:25 1468:2,14 1471:15 plain 1500:22 potential 1582:12 1499:18 1501:4 1472:22 1473:7 principal 1480:20,25 plaintiff 1577:4 Powell 1527:17 1474:19 1475:16 1518:12 1547:23 1555:16 1478:5,16,17,23 plan 1465:18,19 1583:6 1588:5 1479:4,5,7,8,9 1480:3, **principal's** 1480:21 1467:25 1471:25 11 1483:8 1486:17 1472:1 1478:3 1487:10 power 1478:22 1497:23 printed 1579:1 1597:9 1490:18 1492:21 1492:18 1524:14 1542:17 1598:5 1494:23 1495:2.20 1582:10 practice 1548:9 1496:19 1497:18.24 prior 1502:23 1563:3 plane 1519:20 1570:10 1508:15 1518:25 practices 1551:13 1572:7,12 1538:25 1541:19 planet 1579:11 problem 1532:4 practicing 1561:17 1542:18 1557:11 play 1523:12 1574:3,9,12 1576:9 1559:1,3 1576:20 Prairie 1552:12 1568:2 1582:13 1579:19 played 1465:22 1472:4 preceding 1467:11 problematic 1551:6 person's 1506:24 player 1561:24 **precise** 1469:2 1574:3 procedures 1454:6 **plumbing** 1530:22 predated 1511:4 **personal** 1458:10 proceedings 1586:17 pocket 1513:22 1596:11 1600:2 prefer 1590:24 personally 1479:1 point 1456:2 1459:6,8 1517:9,10 1567:11 proceeds 1553:2 prejudice 1454:19 1486:1 1504:16 1482:2 1485:4 1508:11 personnel 1533:12 1508:23 1540:14 process 1484:9 1542:22 1549:6 prepare 1547:19 1530:14 1557:19 persons 1462:8 1554:10,25 1589:13 1464:17,25 1466:4,10 **prepared** 1463:24 1470:25 1471:7 pointed 1496:23 produce 1455:2 1514:5 1482:22 1472:12,18 1479:7,12 1497:3 producing 1459:10 presence 1466:8 1480:3 1487:23 policies 1478:23 1472:16 1479:19 professional 1555:8 perspective 1567:15 1497:24 1542:18 1586:15 1596:12 1543:13 profit 1477:12 pertaining 1462:16 present 1511:16 policy 1500:5 programs 1548:15 pertains 1522:23 presentation 1597:22 1535:7 **polite** 1555:11,18 progression 1578:16 presented 1455:23 1564:16 Peter 1574:25 1583:19 project 1527:10 1457:6 1594:9 **Ponzi** 1510:15,16,18,19 1530:16 1532:21 phase 1453:16 1477:23 **preserve** 1586:13 1546:25 1580:5 1511:1,3,7,12 1571:4,5 1552:24 1575:18 preside 1453:20 project's 1552:24 **phone** 1502:15 Ponzi-like 1509:3 presiding 1484:15,16 1528:13 projections 1524:2,17 1571:4 1525:11 1591:17

Index: performed..projections

projects 1524:14,20 1526:15,16,18,19 1527:19 1528:1,5,7,21 1530:7,8,24 1532:3,9, 22 1533:12,15 1579:19

promise 1454:20 1488:23 1508:2,5

promised 1573:23

promises 1469:6 1473:12 1475:2 1476:8 1495:7 1496:10

proof 1454:3 1455:9, 12,16,17 1457:10 1466:12 1468:21,22 1472:9,20 1473:18 1479:1 1537:14 1539:11 1558:15 1559:4 1560:6,7,17 1561:6,7 1566:1

proper 1453:21

properly 1512:19

properties 1517:17 1518:2,5 1527:6

property 1468:2 1473:12 1474:5 1475:2 1476:7 1478:5 1492:20 1495:8 1496:9,21 1526:21,22 1527:4 1542:7 1596:17

proposed 1471:13

prosecution 1572:7,12

prosecution's 1512:13

prosecutor 1510:8,13 1514:19 1515:5,15 1518:25 1521:4 1553:22 1571:17

prosecutor's 1510:8

prosecutors 1516:19 1519:1

prospectuses 1517:1

Prosperity 1492:4,8

protects 1556:23 1558:5,17

prove 1453:13 1455:2 1460:15,17 1461:21 1463:3 1465:23 1466:2,

4 1467:18 1468:25 1469:8 1472:5,12 1473:14 1477:3 1487:16,20,23 1488:2 1493:22,24 1494:5 1495:9,16 1514:4 1515:7 1521:23 1539:6, 17 1541:12 1559:7

proved 1455:10 1457:19 1462:3 1465:5 1466:22 1469:3,14 1473:25 1474:3,5 1476:23 1480:7 1482:16 1485:9,16 1496:17

proven 1455:8 1467:11,13 1475:13 1476:4 1486:3 1495:11 1514:10

proves 1461:23 1467:21 1477:5 1558:8

provide 1500:3 1530:12 1543:21 1544:17 1551:17 1553:11 1578:13

provided 1468:10 1478:13 1482:24 1484:8 1493:10 1512:22 1540:1 1568:3

providing 1511:20 1549:10

proving 1455:5 1514:7 1535:7 1558:18 1563:18

provision 1554:2,7

public 1466:25 1488:12 1497:5 1498:16 1499:12 1500:7 1501:11 1503:8 1541:8 1583:24 1592:7,9

pull 1488:19

pulls 1515:22

Pulte 1580:1

punished 1486:5

punishment 1462:11, 12 1485:23 1486:7 1508:12

purchase 1473:13

1475:3 1476:10 1477:16,21,24 1495:8 1529:8 1560:12

purpose 1463:25 1465:1,11,13 1466:16 1467:6 1468:19 1469:2 1471:8,18,20 1472:24 1482:12 1486:19,21 1489:21 1493:20 1523:25 1539:9 1541:3, 4,22 1573:14,16

purposefully 1480:14

purposely 1468:17 1493:18

purposes 1537:15

push 1530:7 1571:13

put 1490:18 1494:24 1521:10 1526:15 1527:11 1532:2 1534:5 1546:11 1556:2 1559:2, 16 1565:15 1566:16 1567:14 1570:13 1572:23,24,25 1573:1, 10 1574:15 1579:2 1583:23 1587:9

puts 1504:22

putting 1581:23 1584:20

Q

qualified 1461:8 1551:17

qualifies 1545:19

quality 1571:11

quantity 1571:12

quarterback 1521:18

quarterly 1490:21 1499:7 1575:13

question 1454:12 1456:14 1463:7 1483:18,21,24 1484:2 1485:23 1513:11 1523:11 1546:16 1547:4 1564:20,24 1565:4,5,23,24 1567:21 1569:14,17,22 1590:23 1592:15,17 **questions** 1455:25 1456:11,12 1458:8,17 1484:10 1491:21 1553:22 1555:12 1559:13 1563:13 1564:14 1565:1,2

1567:20 1571:19

Index: projects..read

1576:4 1596:4 **quick** 1589:20

quickly 1511:15 1515:13 1516:1 1553:13 1555:4 1564:20 1571:16

R

racial 1482:5

raided 1519:19

raise 1485:17 1486:5

ran 1534:22

Ranch 1579:25

range 1590:2

rate 1507:3 1548:1 1575:6 1581:16

re-engaging 1580:4

re-go 1497:11

reach 1457:1 1459:6 1481:17,23 1540:21 1541:23 1545:10,25 1549:12 1553:11 1565:20 1567:16 1572:16

reached 1483:10 1488:6,7 1567:15

reaching 1454:8 1459:4 1464:22 1471:5

reacted 1562:6

reacting 1562:5

read 1453:17 1464:21 1471:4 1483:14 1492:16 1497:12,16 1504:21 1505:14 1506:11,17 1511:19 1517:1 1520:10,12,13 1529:10 1537:25 1550:17 1552:9

1557:22,25 1575:9,11

			<u>'</u>
1577:7 1580:20 1592:10 1593:14	1587:25 1588:3,9,11 recall 1562:8 1567:1	1475:5,22 1476:17 1496:3,5,14	1561:13 1562:9,11,24 1563:13 1568:7 1573:7
readers 1520:9	recalled 1525:2 1544:4	regulator 1554:23	1578:24 1583:12 1584:8 1586:3,5
reading 1557:20	receipt 1477:15	regulators 1522:24	1588:19 1594:9,13,15,
1558:25	receipts 1597:7	reimbursement	16
ready 1453:15,16	receive 1528:24	1591:2	remind 1457:18
real 1490:16 1500:3 1510:3,4,9,10,12	received 1454:18	REIT 1566:17 1567:8	Renee 1579:10
1511:13 1512:19	1463:25 1492:24	reiterate 1533:22	renewal 1531:25
1517:15,21,24 1543:20 1551:22 1561:1	1548:23	reject 1461:14	repaid 1494:3 1512:20 1516:4,5
1564:20 1566:14	receives 1564:17,21	relate 1587:6 1590:3	repay 1499:1 1525:3,9
1567:6 1573:17 1575:9, 16 1596:17	recess 1535:15 1589:5	related 1469:16 1484:10 1537:4	1579:6
realized 1488:15,16,18	recipe 1495:14	1542:14 1546:8	repaying 1525:11
1520:7	reckless 1468:7 1478:9	1568:15	repayment 1578:13
reason 1455:14 1457:1	recognize 1569:18	related-party 1540:5, 13,19 1545:5,13,20	repeat 1564:20
1458:9 1463:10 1490:13,16 1492:24	recognizes 1479:3	1546:1 1554:6 1565:14,	repeatedly 1530:6
1496:25 1510:7,10	recollection 1456:8	17,22 1580:21 1587:7	1574:18
1523:7 1560:2 1569:11	recommend 1517:5	relates 1557:13 1588:5	reply 1483:5
reasonable 1455:6,8, 12,14,16 1456:23	record 1571:2 1583:10	relationship 1458:12 1477:19 1503:22	report 1498:15,16 1582:1 1592:22
1457:16,20 1460:6	1587:11 1596:18	release 1523:11 1530:9	reported 1534:25
1461:23 1462:3 1463:5 1465:6 1466:23	records 1464:9 1499:4	1581:5 1599:24,25	reports 1474:22
1467:11,13,22 1469:3,	1500:21 1531:17 1570:19,20 1590:21	released 1600:1	1475:7,24 1476:19
14 1470:15 1471:14 1473:18 1474:1,3,6	1593:1,2 1596:17,18	releases 1530:24	represent 1535:24
1475:13 1476:4,23	1597:13	1594:7,8	representation
1477:6 1479:22 1480:1, 8 1481:8 1482:17	redirect 1523:12 1534:4	relevant 1507:11 1549:18 1554:10	1462:24 1463:4 1468:6, 8,12 1478:8,11,14
1485:10,16 1486:3	reexamine 1482:8	Reliable 1563:7	1493:8 1539:24,25
1495:17 1514:7,8,11,13 1515:6,7 1521:24	refer 1598:7	relied 1463:24 1492:1	representations
1531:9 1532:14	reference 1453:6	1564:10	1467:3 1469:5 1473:11 1475:1 1476:8 1495:7
1533:24 1535:7 1538:6, 24 1539:17 1540:16,22	references 1587:1	rely 1455:18 1463:9,11	1496:10 1587:4
1545:8,24 1558:9,19,20	refinance 1490:14	1464:4 1560:8 1564:5 1565:11 1566:22	representative 1526:5
1559:4,8,23,24 1560:2, 6,24,25 1561:8,10	1546:23	1567:21 1575:19	represents 1551:3
1563:11,19 1564:12	refinanced 1547:20	remainder 1492:15	reputation 1459:13,15,
1565:12,13,19 1566:7, 8,24,25 1567:17,23	refinances 1490:17	remarks 1538:11	23 1493:11 1514:25 1538:18
1568:10,24,25 1569:24	refinancing 1507:2	remember 1453:14	request 1496:25
1570:22 1571:8,9,21,24 1572:1,4,9	1530:23 1548:14 1569:20 1581:5	1482:14 1485:5 1488:4 1498:21 1512:23	1504:19 1506:10
reasons 1461:17	reflects 1464:4	1514:23 1516:11	1530:2,20 1576:14 1578:2
1528:2,22 1556:6	refuse 1521:1	1518:16 1519:16,22 1520:10 1525:20	requesting 1573:18,20
1561:16	registered 1474:20	1527:24 1534:21	1596:23
rebuttal 1586:20	1691316164 1474.20	1546:11 1550:3	

Index: readers..requesting

requests 1490:14,17 1525:19,21 1529:15,16 1533:14 1575:2 1591:19

require 1455:1 1514:4

required 1455:11 1474:22 1475:6,23 1476:18 1488:24 1493:22,23 1494:4,5 1497:6 1516:6

requires 1457:14 1468:21,22 1539:11 1560:21

Research 1512:24

Reserve 1580:7

residential 1547:1

resources 1510:24 1511:2 1570:4

respect 1460:7 1538:25 1553:23,24 1563:11 1569:13

respected 1519:19

respectful 1555:8,12, 18

respective 1456:4 1475:17,21 1476:12,16

response 1534:6 1589:7 1592:14 1598:7

responses 1555:13

responsible 1479:11, 15 1481:1

responsive 1555:7,11, 18,19,20

rest 1579:9

rested 1453:15

restriction 1516:13

restrictions 1453:12

resubmitted 1527:2

result 1549:12,24 1553:12 1567:15

retire 1504:7 1585:1 1594:17

retired 1593:21,24 1595:15

return 1462:7 1473:16, 22 1535:10 1556:7 1575:21 1576:2

returning 1482:13

reurged 1527:2

reveal 1483:7

revenue 1512:18

review 1528:18,23 1552:16 1554:25 1555:5 1564:2 1572:15

reviewed 1544:3 1563:20

reviewing 1554:6

rich 1581:3

Richards 1523:3 1527:5 1529:21 1530:2, 5 1534:11 1578:22 1579:10

Rick 1547:11

rise 1460:5 1495:16 1515:5 1532:19 1533:24

risk 1470:6 1494:8,11 1513:9 1550:6 1577:19 1583:23 1584:20

road 1536:7 1540:10 1542:10,24 1543:10

rob 1487:13

robbing 1488:4

Rogers 1530:1

role 1523:13

roll 1506:1

room 1482:18 1526:17 1573:11 1585:2,4 1586:6,7

RSI 1592:22

rule 1454:13 1561:25

rules 1453:24 1454:4, 10 1536:7 1540:10 1542:10,24 1543:9 1583:14

ruling 1588:17

run 1515:18,24,25

1521:17 1549:8 1550:21,23 1555:10

running 1484:19 1508:24 1509:1 1512:9 1524:21 1542:20 1550:20

Ryan 1523:8 1524:7

S

S11 1582:12

sale 1473:13 1475:3 1476:11 1477:21,24 1495:8

sales 1505:23,24 1529:12 1582:6

San 1563:12

Sanchez 1504:15

sat 1559:12

scenario 1560:24,25

scene 1466:8 1472:16 1479:19

scheme 1465:15,18,19 1466:1,2,20,25 1467:2, 7,14,25 1468:3 1469:2, 4,16,18,19 1470:4,8 1471:22,25 1472:1,8,10 1473:7,10 1474:2,4,11, 18,25 1475:15 1476:6, 10 1477:18 1478:3,6 1484:6 1486:21 1487:9, 10 1488:12 1489:3,22 1491:23 1492:18,21 1493:25 1495:2,5 1496:18,20 1498:10 1509:3 1510:15,16,18, 20 1511:1,3,7,12,21,25 1512:1 1541:8,15 1542:1,7 1550:4,10,20 1571:4,5 1575:18 1583:21 1584:18

school 1555:23

scientific 1461:3,5

scoop 1527:9

Scott 1576:25

scramble 1502:3 1504:18 1515:15,16

1516:3 1518:12,13 1520:13

Index: requests..selected

scrap 1519:12

screen 1487:4 1505:9 1565:15

search 1511:4,5 1512:23 1519:17 1520:16,18 1534:22

seated 1453:2 1578:18 1586:10 1589:6 1593:8 1596:13

SEC 1489:18,25 1490:9,13,19,22 1492:1 1495:24 1496:24 1497:1 1498:12,13,14 1499:22 1502:18 1503:6 1506:5 1508:3,5 1523:13 1531:3 1580:19 1581:2,23 1583:24 1584:23

secret 1481:20

Section 1464:14,15,16, 21 1466:19 1470:22,23, 24 1471:3 1474:13,16, 23 1475:10,12,22,24 1476:1,3,17,19,24

securities 1470:19,21 1471:1,2,5,16 1473:3,8, 13 1474:9,11,15,20,21 1475:5,6,9,11,16,22,24 1476:2,11,17,18,19,22 1478:2,24 1480:9 1487:19 1494:15,17,20, 23 1495:13,17,21 1496:2,5,13,16 1497:25 1506:21 1540:4 1541:18,20,24 1542:6 1557:13 1580:16 1582:17 1583:5 1584:22,23

security 1474:19 1475:4 1477:10,13,17, 20,22,24 1483:5 1495:3 1496:11

seeking 1564:18,22

seized 1529:7

select 1482:19

selected 1551:4 1557:20 1558:12

1559:6	1592:18 1595:17	SK 1512:23 1582:1	speaks 1579:17
self-explanatory	1599:13,14	skill 1461:8 1532:8	special 1454:11 1500:18 1546:25
1483:12	showed 1509:22	skills 1580:18	
sell 1543:22,24 1544:20	1512:17 1529:18 1531:22	slate 1455:1 1514:2	specialized 1461:4,5
1553:1	showing 1460:10	1537:10 1558:7,13	specific 1454:4 1467:9
selling 1544:9	1533:6 1590:17	slide 1543:15 1547:19	1468:4,17 1469:12 1490:12 1493:2,19
send 1491:14 1529:22 1585:24	shown 1474:15	Smart 1555:7,11,17	1515:8 1539:8,16
sending 1530:21	1488:14 1490:10 1495:21 1550:23	smoke 1537:1 1553:13	1541:14 1554:24 1557:8,9,11 1580:14
1570:15	1557:2	snapshot 1536:18	1589:9 1590:23
sense 1455:15 1457:1	shows 1491:8 1503:1,4	1554:17	1591:12
1524:20 1560:3 1569:6, 9,11,12 1570:1,3	1505:16 1514:19 1538:9 1551:4 1582:13	Snyder 1564:9	specifically 1524:23 1580:19 1583:24
		sold 1478:2	
sentence 1459:21 1508:12 1529:7	shredding 1570:11,20	sole 1457:24 1529:19	spectator 1479:24
	side 1459:5,8 1482:3	solely 1454:17 1456:15	speculate 1456:12
separate 1462:14,22 1592:3	1522:20 1523:14 1531:1 1547:10	1482:11 1523:25	spell 1580:23
separately 1462:17,18	1559:20 1561:19	1553:16 1559:9	spend 1556:24
September 1505:22	1589:1 sidebar 1509:10,12	somebody's 1508:15 1519:11	spending 1570:10
1524:24 1525:5,20,21 1526:9,10	1589:4	someone's 1513:22 1514:20	spent 1468:20 1517:2 1529:14
series 1552:15,16	sides 1453:15 1456:4		spoke 1531:15,16
set 1585:24,25 1597:22	sign 1483:2,10 1484:16 1529:20 1599:18	sort 1490:2 1494:25 1497:15 1502:25	spoken 1577:13
settle 1576:23	significant 1456:3	1505:8,15 1556:25 1562:16 1563:14	spreadsheet 1491:3,
sewage 1530:22	1493:1 1494:25	sought 1480:16	11,14 1506:5 1526:13, 14,16,24 1527:12,15,
Shahan 1552:12	1512:16	1586:23	21,24 1528:1,9,25
1568:2	similarities 1543:1	sound 1579:12	1529:1 1532:19,21 1533:13 1582:1
shared 1480:19	simple 1575:9,17	1581:16	1585:10,22
shareholders 1467:1 1488:13 1541:8	simplest 1576:4	sounded 1507:4,9 1508:22	spreadsheets 1532:2
sharing 1477:12	simply 1459:4 1516:20 1529:9 1552:4	sounding 1577:19	staff 1529:23
sheet 1591:16	single 1513:13,21	soundness 1461:16	stalled 1580:5
shell 1575:23	1519:5 1532:20 1535:1	sounds 1526:11	stand 1518:4 1527:3
	1539:20 1540:6,11,12 1555:2 1556:5 1573:14	1576:21,23 1597:14	1532:16,18 1539:20
ship 1574:16	1576:7 1582:17,18	source 1498:18	1544:13,15 1545:7 1554:5 1556:2,3
short 1509:16	sir 1535:19 1556:13	1500:13 1501:9 1580:3	standard 1539:15
shortfall 1550:2	1585:18,19 1593:6	SP 1547:3	1541:23
show 1477:25 1494:8,	1599:15	space 1482:24 1484:8,	stands 1483:8
10 1510:14 1511:17 1531:24 1533:5	sit 1504:11 1537:11	15,16	start 1459:20 1485:14
1542:21 1547:20	1558:4 1573:10	spades 1587:19	1486:1 1508:14 1514:2
1552:19 1557:24 1559:22 1562:23	situation 1580:15	speak 1482:20 1537:14	1536:3 1537:6 1552:15 1556:25 1558:6
1581:25 1589:17	sixth 1577:11	1557:18	1562:21 1571:14

1587:25 1593:2

started 1484:20 1488:20 1508:10.24 1509:1,2,20 1542:5 1543:4 **starting** 1488:14 1533:9 1560:13 starts 1502:4,10 1508:21 **state** 1454:13 1461:9 1463:21,22 1539:5 1579:20 1580:11 stated 1461:25 1465:25 1472:7 statement 1460:17 1463:8,10 1509:20 1510:14 1536:1,6 1543:11,16 1565:22 statements 1455:25 1460:14,15,16,18,19 1575:9 1576:3,7,12 1582:20 **States** 1463:22,23 1470:22,24 1471:3 1476:3 1506:19 1508:18 1537:21 1540:5

1464:14,16,20 1466:18 1474:13,16,23 1475:12

status 1525:23

stay 1524:19

steal 1557:12 1574:24

Stephanie 1526:9 1534:2 1555:19

Stephens 1459:18 1509:9 1535:14,17,20, 23 1565:15 1566:16,19 1568:1 1573:5 1583:9 1585:19 1586:13,19 1588:25 1589:12,16 1591:11,23 1592:3,11 1597:18,20 1598:20,24 1599:3,7,10,12,17

Stephens' 1565:23

stipulations 1455:24

stock 1477:10,11 1517:7.9

stop 1524:25 1545:3 1564:25 1586:7

stopped 1584:12

story 1559:20 1561:19

straight 1562:11 1592:16

strategy 1574:19

stretch 1577:21 1586:7

strict 1455:9 1560:18, 21

strictly 1552:4

structured 1544:6 1548:10

stuck 1595:8,12

study 1591:2

studying 1556:20

stuff 1590:21

stupidity 1463:13,15

subjected 1544:13

submit 1495:11 1532:12 1580:6

submittal 1579:24,25

submitted 1498:13 1527:1,3,10 1580:5

subparagraph

1495:18 1496:7,16,20

subscribe 1477:16

subsequent 1489:2 1505:3 1552:23 1557:13 1583:21

substance 1523:17

substantial 1559:17

substantially 1469:6

substantive 1474:8 1495:23 1498:7 1541:24 1584:22

substitute 1454:14

succeed 1469:19

succeeded 1466:6 1472:14 1488:3 1493:25

successful 1480:17

sudden 1562:3

suffered 1470:7 1494:13 1512:6.11 1517:13

sufficient 1465:19 1467:21 1472:1 1477:5 1479:20 1521:23 1532:14 1533:2

sugarcoat 1509:5

suggest 1458:7 1554:23 1557:6,15 1559:18 1560:4 1567:24 1575:23 1584:4 1587:14

suggested 1507:1 1574:2 1587:21 1588:10

suggesting 1554:16 1588:1

suggestion 1587:18

summaries 1464:7

summarize 1550:13

summarized 1541:16

summarizing 1537:4

summary 1463:24 1464:3 1492:7 1498:21 1499:5 1500:8 1502:1 1507:15

superior 1577:22

supplement 1597:9

supplies 1529:6

supportive 1555:22

supposed 1499:6 1513:23 1521:15 1563:20 1566:9 1577:11

supposedly 1551:6

surely 1568:5,19

surprise 1516:16,18

surrounding 1527:25

Susan 1527:17 1547:23 1555:16 1588:5

suspect 1571:16

sustained 1456:10

Index: started..TBG

swears 1525:22

switching 1586:24

sworn 1454:9 1455:23

1559:7

sympathetic 1485:11

sympathy 1454:20 1482:2 1485:4 1508:11

svphoned 1511:14

system 1569:7,8

Т

table 1538:20 1539:2

tail's 1578:6

takeaways 1506:15

talk 1489:24 1510:1,11

takes 1525:16

taking 1509:2,4 1595:21

1511:10 1513:11.16 1515:13 1519:24 1524:22 1526:13 1528:16 1531:5,6,24 1536:6,10 1539:19 1542:11,16 1547:17 1551:14 1556:21 1557:16 1558:21 1559:23 1560:24 1561:10 1562:1 1564:25 1579:21

talked 1485:2,5,13 1526:19 1530:16 1538:12 1542:9

1584:5

1546:12 1548:20 1549:17 1563:22

1564:13 1579:15

talking 1508:15 1536:13 1543:8.9 1554:3 1556:24 1578:1

talks 1518:16 1525:9, 10

tapes 1570:5

TBG 1577:18

team 1555:9,14,20 technical 1461:3,5 technicalities 1575:19

television 1505:16 1508:18

telling 1499:11 1507:25 1509:21 1516:19 1547:7,9 1561:22 1564:8 1577:22 1579:10 1581:24 1582:3.11

tells 1514:19 1558:1 1569:10 1578:6 1585:25

temporary 1477:14

tendency 1462:25 1468:13 1478:15 1493:12

term 1468:15 1477:10, 21 1478:17 1497:18 1541:5 1542:14 1587:10

terms 1453:9 1597:21

terra 1518:4

territory 1463:21,22

test 1582:21

tested 1576:5

testified 1458:3,15,23 1460:10 1503:14 1527:5 1561:14 1571:22 1572:5,10 1581:22

testify 1455:4 1461:9

testifying 1459:7

testimony 1455:24 1456:16,23 1457:8 1458:1,2,6,18,19,23 1459:1,13,16,24 1460:9,13,20,24 1461:1,13,14 1464:1 1492:23 1500:9 1505:22 1506:3,5,6,9 1511:20 1519:16 1520:11 1538:18 1540:15,23 1542:21 1544:3,7,12,14 1545:1, 13 1550:24 1551:18 1554:4 1561:12,20 1562:13 1563:10 1564:4 1566:6,18 1567:19 1583:10,13 1587:19 1588:5

testing 1551:4 1582:20

Texas 1489:12 1492:1, 6 1498:20 1499:1,5 1501:8,24 1579:20 1580:11

textbook 1565:12

theories 1586:24 1588:1

theory 1551:18,24 1572:6,11 1576:5,12

thing 1482:18 1485:20, 25 1497:15 1501:22 1502:8,9 1503:11 1505:2 1507:25 1508:8 1510:2 1521:1 1523:10 1530:13 1540:2 1547:11 1548:12 1549:13 1551:8 1553:5 1556:22 1558:10,12,23, 24 1562:16 1564:19,23 1569:1,5 1582:11 1596:23

things 1456:3 1458:14 1467:19 1477:4 1496:23 1497:3 1505:6 1523:14 1527:7,8 1536:2 1544:8,11,24 1577:8 1581:25 1593:1

think's 1507:25

thinking 1561:4 1595:14,15

third-party 1491:12,13 1575:22

Thompson 1513:7

thought 1484:19 1487:2 1531:21 1562:7 1582:15 1593:11

three-quarters-of-a-million 1517:10

thumb 1585:9,11,23 1598:4

Tidwell 1489:24 1555:24 1577:25

Tilly 1513:5

Tim 1531:15 1534:23

time 1460:11 1468:16 1481:9 1485:15 1499:14 1506:6,9 1509:17 1514:24 1517:3 1522:11 1524:8 1529:14 1533:1,25 1550:13 1553:4 1554:11,17,25 1555:3 1556:9,15,16,24 1562:25 1568:7 1570:7 1572:8,14,21 1577:11, 14 1581:7

times 1482:14 1485:8 1503:1 1505:1,2,3 1531:23 1560:13 1577:13

title 1464:14,16,20 1466:18 1470:22,24 1471:3 1474:12,16,23 1475:11 1476:2 1593:1, 2 1596:18 1597:10,13

today 1510:20,21 1511:9 1519:1 1538:9, 20 1578:4 1579:6,8

Todd 1575:11

told 1455:21 1472:25 1489:12 1500:6 1503:3 1510:24 1514:3 1515:5, 10 1516:21 1518:7,18, 25 1520:5,22 1521:4 1524:7,10,23 1526:2,9, 21 1528:2,5,14 1530:6, 11 1532:16,18 1534:13 1543:11 1547:24 1548:4 1557:3 1558:10, 11 1560:17 1562:22 1569:1 1573:22 1577:14 1583:6,24

Tom 1490:23 1548:11

tomorrow 1487:19

toolbox 1536:8

top 1528:13 topic 1589:9

1000.0

totally 1516:5,8 touch 1529:23

touched 1536:3 1545:5

Towey 1514:23

trace 1499:8

traced 1504:25 1505:1, 2 1521:2

Index: team..transparency

tracing 1552:5 1553:14

Tract 1580:8

trail 1460:20

training 1461:8

traits 1460:4,7 1515:3 1539:1

transaction 1463:7 1477:23 1503:19,23 1504:2,5,8 1518:21 1519:7,11 1521:20 1523:23 1536:17 1540:12,13,18,19,20 1545:5,9 1546:1,2 1547:4 1548:6 1549:4 1550:18 1554:1,9 1563:17,25 1564:2 1565:21,22 1569:19 1580:21 1590:4 1591:11,12 1592:7

transactions 1489:14
1491:18 1503:3,9,18,21
1508:2,6 1512:25
1523:16 1536:19
1540:6,7 1543:2
1544:4,6 1545:12,13,20
1546:5,13 1547:8,9,15
1548:10 1549:2 1550:9,
14,15 1551:3,6,23
1552:11 1554:6,7
1561:1 1565:15,17
1566:10 1572:2
1573:13,24 1575:24
1582:21 1587:7,8,13
1588:8

transfer 1470:9 1515:11 1581:10

transfers 1547:24

transition 1525:13 1547:17

transmission 1490:2

transmitted 1467:4,5 1469:9 1489:20

transparency 1511:15 1551:5,11

transparent 1512:19 1550:19 1551:7.12 1557:3 transparently 1531:18 travel 1463:20 treasury 1477:11 treat 1560:15 treated 1505:19 trend 1527:18 trends 1529:6 **Trez** 1524:6 1580:23,25 trial 1453:5,17,18,20,23 1454:18 1455:23 1456:10,18,21 1460:13 1461:1 1462:5,8 1538:21 1558:13 1594:10 trick 1564:24,25 1565:1,4 1569:17,22 trips 1570:10 trouble 1486:4 true 1457:23 1460:16, 17 1490:13 1496:25 1511:3 1512:7 1518:24 1526:7 trust 1528:6 trustees 1534:25 truth 1458:10 1459:24 1464:7 1468:7,9 1478:10,12 1493:9 1520:4 1538:19 1557:3 1561:22 1562:17 1563:7 1581:25 truthful 1582:14 tug 1508:16 **TV** 1487:3 1570:1,2

type 1501:22 1515:1 1540:24 1548:6 typo 1459:21

Tyson 1506:9 1561:24

U

U.S. 1519:4

UDF 1467:1 1473:8 1475:16.20 1476:11.15 1488:13 1489:5,7,10, 12,15 1490:7,14,15,18, 20 1491:1,15 1492:3,24 1495:21 1496:19 1498:16 1499:11,14,17, 19 1500:9,12,16,20 1501:3,7,13,16,18,20, 25 1502:19,20,22,24 1503:2,4,6,9,11,13,18 1504:1,4,7,16,20 1505:9,10,11,12 1507:4,22,23 1508:1,25 1509:1,2 1511:17,19,20 1512:11,15,22 1516:11, 13,20,24 1517:15 1522:9,15,21 1523:10 1524:1,15 1526:10,11, 15 1527:1,21,22 1529:3,4 1530:11,20 1531:20 1532:24,25 1533:1,19 1534:17 1535:3,4 1536:7 1541:9 1542:11,19 1543:2,4,8, 9,13,17,18,22,23,24,25 1544:7,8,9,16,18,20,22, 24 1545:1,2,3,4 1546:6, 8,10,13,16,17,18,23 1547:8,12,17,18,20,21, 25 1548:6,13,23,24 1549:2,3 1550:4,5,9,10, 18 1552:19,22 1553:3, 5,19 1555:16 1557:2 1563:21 1570:12 1571:22 1574:5,6,11 1575:10,15,20,21 1576:1 1577:22,23 1578:1,11,12,13,23 1579:6,11 1580:20 1581:10 1582:12

UDF's 1523:13 1527:20 1560:25

ultimately 1494:3 1505:11 1506:16 1581:12

1593:24

unanimous 1473:1 1481:18 1482:23 1483:10

unanimously 1467:23 1477:7

uncontroverted

1491:16 1502:14

undercover 1570:5.6

underlined 1495:5 1497:25

underlying 1464:9 1499:7 1536:18 1544:5

underneath 1550:7 1552:10

understand 1458:17 1512:3.24 1517:4 1539:5 1540:10 1543:1 1565:8,10 1575:8

understanding 1461:6

understands 1465:17 1471:24 1487:9

understood 1503:17 1532:18 1548:4 1550:24 1588:7

underwriting 1580:6

undisclosed 1545:20

unencrypted 1598:2

unexplained 1570:9

unfettered 1512:22

United 1463:21,23 1464:14,16,20 1466:18 1470:22,24 1471:3 1474:12,16,23 1475:11 1476:2 1506:19 1508:18 1537:21 1540:5 1548:15

unlawful 1464:25 1465:10,13,15,17 1466:7 1471:7,17,19, 22,24 1472:14 1473:5, 16,20,23 1486:19,20,21 1487:5,8,9 1541:3,4,22

unreasonable 1463:9

untrue 1468:6 1478:9 1540:1

updates 1528:15

upload 1490:8

uploading 1489:25 1490:9

ups 1575:2

urge 1502:1 1504:12 1521:22.25 1560:15 1572:14,16

Index: transparent..violated

utilization 1470:8 1515:10

٧

V's 1489:15 1499:14 1500:9 1501:25 1503:13 1574:6

value-for-value 1569:19

values 1529:4

venture 1480:13,15,17, 18,22,23,25

veracity 1459:24 1538:19

verdict 1453:25 1454:17 1456:14,21 1459:4 1462:7,21 1470:18 1472:25 1473:17,22 1481:17,18, 21 1482:13,22 1483:2, 10,11 1491:22 1514:16 1521:25 1531:11 1535:10,12 1556:7,20 1572:17

verge 1511:8

Veritex 1491:25 1505:9,11 1516:4 1517:24

versus 1508:1

VI 1484:11 1501:2

victim 1463:11,14,15

video 1570:19

view 1545:19

VII 1484:12 1501:6

VIII 1484:12 1501:16

VIII 1484:12 1501:21

Village 1580:5

violate 1480:5 1557:8,

violated 1468:23 1539:12

UNITED STATES vs HOLLIS MORRISON GREENLAW (1) Vol 8 January 20, 2022 4:21-cr-289-O

violation 1464:14 1470:22 1474:12 1475:11 1476:2 1587:10

Visser 1530:10

Vlasak 1490:4 1504:14

voir 1557:19

voluntarily 1463:18 1468:17 1480:4 1493:18 1531:14

volunteered 1513:14, 19

voting 1478:24 1497:25

W

wagging 1578:6

wait 1485:18 1486:5 1545:2 1596:9 1599:20

walk 1509:23 1536:25 1539:3 1541:12

walked 1563:3

wall 1577:20

Walter 1561:24 1562:2.

Walters' 1506:9

wanted 1525:12 1567:16 1584:5

wanting 1593:20 1594:3

warrant 1477:15 1511:4,5 1512:23 1519:17 1520:18

watch 1576:13

watched 1556:15

wavs 1463:4 1467:17 1474:16 1475:8 1477:2 1490:3 1494:22 1495:9, 12 1498:25 1545:14

wealth 1570:9

web 1490:8

Wednesday 1485:2,5, 21 1505:16

week 1502:13 1522:12 1524:10 1577:17 1579:9

weekly 1528:12

weeks 1509:16 1578:21

weigh 1457:6 1561:12

weighed 1458:23

weighing 1457:14

weight 1457:25 1460:24 1461:15 1482:11

weights 1457:12

whichever 1495:10 1594:21,22

Whitley 1527:19 1528:18 1545:23 1547:23 1555:19 1565:18 1566:4 1571:22 1579:17 1580:13 1582:3

wholly 1500:23

willful 1522:18 1541:23

willfully 1465:12 1468:15,22 1471:19 1486:20 1493:14,15,17 1539:3,7,11 1541:4,5

wind-down 1525:13,16

wire 1464:10,13,18,19, 22 1465:8 1466:18,20 1467:5 1469:9,11,15, 21,23 1486:11,18,24,25 1488:8,10 1489:19,20 1490:1,11 1491:19,23 1492:12 1493:21.23 1494:6,19 1495:13 1506:20 1540:4,25 1541:1,2,6 1557:13 1579:11,13 1584:19 1595:11

wired 1469:17 1491:21

wires 1490:4,5,6,7 1499:9

wiring 1579:10

wisdom 1454:12

Wissink 1483:19

1502:8 1539:23 1572:18 1578:11 1579:8

witness's 1458:1,18 1461:16

witnesses 1454:4 1455:24 1458:2,19 1459:5,7 1461:2 1516:12 1519:5 1520:14 1523:4,9 1526:20 1527:13 1533:9 1539:20 1540:16,24 1556:3 1559:14 1561:12 1562:1 1571:22

woefully 1520:25 1575:13

women 1503:2 1549:10 1568:13 1576:9 1580:10

wonderful 1562:16

wondering 1489:23

Woods 1580:1

word 1463:17 1467:17 1468:15 1477:2 1478:21 1493:15 1497:22 1557:24,25

words 1456:25 1479:25 1510:8,16 1575:11

work 1523:9 1524:18 1534:16 1549:7 1577:5 1596:3,8

worked 1523:4 1527:24 1532:24 1534:2,12 1555:7,24

working 1507:8,10 1555:25 1568:6 1581:18 1583:18 1596:3.7

works 1487:6,19 1518:11 1554:20 1555:21 1578:22

world 1569:8

worth 1565:16 1577:5

Wow 1560:10

wrap 1537:3 1555:4

Index: violation.. Young

write 1482:23 1483:4 1498:23 1507:17 1599:5

writing 1467:6 1483:5 1489:21 1526:1,2

written 1453:9 1498:2

wrong 1482:9 1509:21, 24 1511:19 1520:7,25 1521:14,15,16,17 1527:12 1528:21 1532:1 1545:3 1584:9

Υ

y'all 1485:5,14 1487:14 1489:23 1495:10 1497:6 1498:21

y'all's 1506:1

year 1524:18 1534:18

years 1495:24 1510:5 1511:9 1517:4,5 1519:18 1520:15,19 1521:2 1522:17 1525:16 1532:7 1551:21 1552:1,2 1554:5,22 1555:7,22 1561:15 1566:16 1568:8,17 1570:4,21 1577:11 1580:18

yellow 1494:25 1495:6

York 1489:25 1490:8

you-all 1588:19 Young 1513:6,9

would-be 1489:7,12,15